3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

175 >68 Dobrogeanu-Gherea argued that a state of permanent crisis in Rumania was being effected by the impact of Western political and economic forms upon the traditional Rumanian pattern. The result was an unfortunate hybrid, *neoiobăgia* (neoserfdom), the form of liberal-bourgeois institutions superimposed upon a feudal reality. Although Dobrogeanu-Gherea placed excessive trust in neoiobăgia as an all-inclusive explanation, he correctly realized that Rumania's contact with the Western world had a dynamic and by no means simple effect upon the existing economic and social structure.[8]

Economic and Social Roots of the Agrarian Problem[9]

● 311 An extreme concentration of land in large estates, an excessive fragmentation of small holdings, and the insignificance of medium-sized properties were the most obvious elements of the Rumanian agrarian problem at that time. In 1905 the disparity between large and small holdings probably exceeded that of any state in Europe, including Russia. On the basis of his investigations, which are probably the most accurate available, G. D. Creangă estimated that Rumanian properties were divided in the following manner: in the terminology of the time, small properties (0–10 hectares), comprising over 95 per cent of all properties, covered 40 per cent of the arable and grazing land; medium properties (10–100 hectares), comprising 4 per cent of all properties, occupied 11 per cent; whereas about 5,000 large and latifundiary estates held nearly 50 per cent.[10] If forests, orchards, and vineyards are included, the area covered by large property exceeded 57 per cent. These figures on property do not, of course, include the landless peasants. Creangă estimated that there were at that time about 300,000 peasants without land and

8. For a further analysis of Dobrogeanu-Gherea's ideas in connection with Rumanian Social Democracy, see below, pp. 276–280.

9. More extensive, and in some respects conflicting, discussions of the economic background of the agrarian problem are given in David Mitrany, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "Economic and Social History of the World War" (London; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930), and Marcel Emerit, *Les Paysans Roumains depuis le traité d'Andrinople jusqu'à la libération des terres (1829–1864)* (Paris, 1937).

10. In numbers the division was as follows:

Size of holdings in hectares	*Number of holdings*	*Area in hectares*
0–10	920,989	3,158,645
10–100	38,723	862,800
Over 100	5,385	3,810,351
	965,047	7,826,796

For more detailed figures on the distribution of property see the Appendix.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

another 200,000 who held property jointly and were not included in his computations.

On the assumption that a holding of less than 3 hectares was totally inadequate, at the Rumanian level of production, to provide a family with even the bare means of subsistence, Creangă concluded that over 60 per cent of the peasant cultivators (landless peasants plus those with less than 3 hectares), "for the most part heads of families, find themselves in unconditional dependence upon landowners and tenants." [11] If peasants owning between 3 and 5 hectares —holdings certainly on the margin of subsistence—are included, it appears that nearly 85 per cent of the peasants were unable to earn a secure living from the produce of their soil and had to seek additional income elsewhere.

The concentration of land in great estates does not, of course, necessarily imply an agrarian crisis; English and Prussian agriculture developed successfully on large properties. Nor does the peasant's need to go beyond his own holding to earn a living necessarily spell misery for him. The reason the large estate appeared at this time to be the central feature of the Rumanian agrarian problem lies in the particular development of rural property and labor relations in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Unfortunately, the background of Rumanian agrarian history is still extremely obscure. The original social function and source of privilege of the landowning nobles, the boyars, have been the subject of several notable but inconclusive controversies among Rumanian scholars. It is not certain when and to what degree the mass of Rumanian cultivators were reduced to a servile status. Evidence provided by villages of *răzeşi* and *moşneni*—free peasant communities with a form of common landholding, which have survived as relics in the hilly districts—suggests that they at one time were a prevalent form of rural organization, but scientific investigation of these villages has been undertaken only in recent years.[12] There is no question, however, that by the eighteenth century the boyars—and the monasteries—had come to control a great deal of the land, to which

11. Creangă, *op. cit.*, I, 189.

12. The term *boier* has been the popular, if historically inaccurate, name for all large landowners. The problem of ascertaining the boyar's original role resembles in some respects the confusion in Russian history between allodial hereditary landowners and the nobility of service. The villages of free peasants (răzeşi in Moldavia and moşneni in Wallachia) pose, in respect to their nature and origins, questions similar to those relating to the Russian *mir* and the South Slav *zadruga*. Illuminating discussions of these points may be found in H. H. Stahl's article, "Organizarea socială a ţărănimii," in *Enciclopedia Romînisi* (4 vols., Bucarest, n.d.), I, 559–576, and in his recent book, *Sociologia satului devălmaş romînesc* (Bucarest, 1946), I.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

566 175 423

ment of labor contracts and even permitted the employment of military force to drive the peasant to work. Although the harsher aspects of these laws were later abandoned, they permanently affected landlord-peasant relations and did much to justify the term neoserfdom, "the confirmation of the old servitudes in contractual form."

Yet these laws, while harsh on the peasant once he fell into the power of the landowner, would be significant only on the assumption that the peasants were increasingly obliged to go to the landowner for assistance. That is, the laws of contracts merely accelerated the relapse into a servile system—one lacking the paternalistic protection of the old order—but were not in themselves the cause of a deteriorating situation. Moreover, the peasant uprisings did not occur when the laws were at their harshest but later when some of the worst provisions had been abrogated.

Land hunger, in general, results from an excess of population relative to the amount of land available. As has been noted, at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Rumanian principalities were not thickly settled, though even at the time of the Organic Statutes it was not possible to give adequate grants of arable land to the peasants in the old and relatively thickly settled mountainous districts. By the middle of the century the boyars were invoking population pressure to explain the high cost of land. There is no question that in the second half of the nineteenth century Rumania's population expanded at a very rapid rate.

• 311

At the same time, however, the expansion of land under cultivation appears to have been increasing even more rapidly, as the plough was put to untilled pastures, waste, and meadow.[17] The extent to which the peasants were able to benefi' from this expansion of cultivated area cannot be estimated with any precision. Undoubtedly much of it took place on large estates under the control of the landowners. To some extent, too, it resulted from the peasants converting their pasture land to arable. The act of 1864 had made no provision for communal pasturing; the small peasant holdings were inadequate for both grain and livestock, and from 1864 there is a notable decline in animal husbandry. It is estimated that whereas in 1860 meadows and pasture comprised 38 per cent of the total surface of Rumania, they were reduced to 17 per cent in the years 1901–5, thus offsetting to a considerable degree the gain in land under cultiva-

17. According to Constantin Garofild, *Chestia agrard in Romdnia* (Bucarest, 1920), p. 128, between 1859 and 1899 the population of Rumania increased by 54 per cent, whereas the area of land under cultivation increased by 85 per cent between 1862 and 1906.

3: Ro. erts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

• 311

tion.[18] Hence it may be concluded that much of the expansion of the arable either took place outside the peasant lands or at the expense of pasture. Against this, however, was the periodic doling out of state land, which, while only a palliative, did serve to balance in some measure the growing pressure of population.[19]

The most that may be said is that the growth of population was beginning to become an important element, one that would become increasingly troublesome in the twentieth century, and that while the plight of the Rumanian peasant at this time cannot really be attributed to rural overpopulation, the ratio of land to labor was shifting to his disadvantage. Given this tendency plus the fact that many peasants never had enough land to begin with, one can see how the landowners, controlling much of the land and armed with the laws on agricultural contracts, were able to preserve a quasi-servile system of social and labor relations.

Another development contributing greatly to social friction in the countryside was the increase, from the middle of the nineteenth century on, of absenteeism on the great estates, as the landowners found it pleasanter to live abroad or to engage in politics in Bucarest. By 1900, 56 per cent of the area of properties over 50 hectares and more than 72 per cent on the vast estates over 5,000 hectares were being leased, for the most part not to individual peasants but to large tenants.

The effects of absenteeism were particularly unfortunate in Rumania. To some extent the tenant may have been performing a useful entrepreneurial function in initiating economic activity,[20] but in most cases he merely sublet the greater part of the land to the peasants, who cultivated it in the old manner. The tenant was inclined to regard his lease, which was usually for a short term, as a speculative venture to provide quick gains not by improved cultivation but by

18. Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Industrie, du Commerce et des Domaines, *La Roumanie, 1866–1906* (Bucarest, 1907), pp. 267–268.

19. According to Creangă, *op. cit.*, I, 80, the state, in addition to some 572,000 hectares granted in 1864, had parceled out approximately 960,000 hectares by 1905.

It is apparently impossible to make a comparison of the average size of peasant properties at these two dates. The average size of the peasant allotments in 1864 was about 3.8 hectares, whereas by the end of the century the average size of peasant properties under 10 hectares was 3.4 hectares. But the first figure does not include peasant properties already held in full ownership in 1864.

20. The entrepreneurial character of the tenant is reflected in the fact that the larger the lease the higher was the percentage of foreign tenants. The problem of foreign tenants was closely associated with Rumanian anti-Semitism, and it was the common charge that Jewish tenants were grinding the peasant and ruining the country. While Jewish tenants were important on the largest estates of Moldavia, the great majority of tenants (78 per cent) were Rumanians.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

making greater demands upon both the land and the peasant. Since his profits tended to be in direct proportion to the area he was able to lease, there was a marked inclination to build up vast agricultural trusts, some of which covered more than 100,000 hectares. Although ultimately the large tenant was a consequence rather than a cause of the agrarian problem, he was the focus of hatred and abuse: hated by the peasants because he dealt directly with them, verbally abused by the landowner-politicians who made him their scapegoat. Certainly some of the more spectacular injustices and preposterous labor contracts can be found on lands operated by tenants.

This speculative interest on the part of the tenant in acquiring more land contributed to a rapid rise in rents. Between 1870 and 1906 rents mounted between 100 and 200 per cent for a third of the properties and over 200 per cent for another third. The peasants consequently were obliged to pay more dearly for the use of land. In 1870 they generally retained from two to four parts of the produce of rented land and delivered one part to the landowner or large tenant; by 1906 in over half the cases studied in an investigation, the ratio was one to one.[21]

The rise in the value of land was not accompanied by an equivalent improvement in agricultural techniques. Most of the peasants were both inexperienced in the careful cultivation of small holdings and financially unable to improve their methods, and the large landowners and tenants had little incentive. By the working of the 1864 reform the peasants remained attached to their strip of land, lacking even the free mobility of the farm laborer. They continued to own most of the means of production: over 90 per cent of the draft animals, ploughs, and harrows in Rumania belonged to the peasants.

Under these conditions the distinction between large-scale and small-scale farming was blurred, and it was characteristic of the latifundiary cultivation prevailing in Rumania that the size of an undertaking was not determined by an organized integration of the productive factors of a given area but was rather the arithmetical sum of a large number of peasant cultivations. The peasant, in return for a piece of land, contracted either to cultivate another piece of land for the proprietor or tenant or to share the produce in a form of metayage. Money payments were uncommon except in Moldavia.[22]

21. Creangă, *op. cit.*, II, 18-22.

22. It must be observed, however, that while the great estates did not, in most cases, utilize progressive farming methods, the output of the large farms was consistently higher than that of the peasant holdings. The reasons for this difference have been the occasion of much dispute. Supporters of large-scale cultivation have held that despite

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

175 tonomy because of the desire not to increase the number of Ukrainians under Polish rule. The incorporation of Bucovina had none of the turbulence that accompanied Bessarabia's. A general congress met on November 28, 1918, and voted for union with Rumania.

● 311 Before the First World War, of the cultivable area of Bucovina, holdings over 100 hectares occupied 25 per cent, holdings between 10 and 100 hectares 27 per cent, and small holdings 48 per cent. (If the very extensive forest lands are included the holdings over 100 hectares covered more than 60 per cent of the surface of the province.) Large properties were less dominant than in the Old Kingdom and medium properties much more important, partly because of German colonization and efforts by the Austrian government to foster this category of holding.

423 The decree-law of September 7, 1919, for the Bucovina land reform was ratified by the law of July, 1921, which modified the decree in favor of the landowners and reduced the extent of land to be expropriated. Land reform in Bucovina was made under more peaceful circumstances than elsewhere and was more carefully worked out. The state was given a right to reserve land for general needs, and the landowner was allowed continued use of his land until it was actually taken over. The reform expropriated in full: estates of foreigners and absentees, mortmain estates, estates of persons who had lost their civil rights, and estates farmed out for more than nine years. Expropriation of private properties was on a sliding scale beginning at 100 hectares and permitting a maximum of 250 hectares on properties having considerable inventory and equipment. Scattered properties belonging to the same owner were counted as one. The allotment of land was made in lots of 4–8 hectares, colonization lots of 5 hectares, and complementary lots of not less than ¼ hectare for peasants having less than 4 hectares. Compensation to landowners was approximately the same as in the Old Kingdom, and the state assumed 50 per cent of the cost. The peasant could pay in whole or in part, the remainder becoming a mortgage payable in 50 years at 5 per cent. According to official statistics the total area expropriated in Bucovina was about 76,000 hectares.[22]

3. TRANSYLVANIA

175 The disputed history of Transylvania and the endless controversy that has raged between the Rumanians and the Hungarians

22. For further statistics on the distribution of land in Bucovina and the effects of the land reform see the Appendix.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

are far too complex for inclusion here. Whatever the origins of the Transylvanian population, at the outbreak of the First World War the Rumanians constituted a majority of the inhabitants of this region; with the collapse of Austria-Hungary, the Transylvanian Rumanians, along with the other ethnic groups in the empire moved to break away. On October 12, 1918, the Rumanian National party of Transylvania drafted a resolution demanding the right of self-determination. A national assembly was called at Alba Iulia on December first and passed a resolution in favor of the union of all Rumanians. The basis of this union was to be:

1) full national liberty for all races;
2) full autonomy for all regions;
3) a democratic regime with general, direct, equal, and secret elections;
4) complete liberty of press, assembly, and association;
5) radical agrarian reform;
6) equitable conditions for industrial workers.

A Governing Council (*Consiliul Dirigent*), under Iuliu Maniu, was established as the temporary administration. The Treaty of Trianon assigned Transylvania and the adjacent regions of Maramureş, Crişana, and the Banat to Rumania.

Servile tenures had been abolished somewhat earlier in Transylvania than in the Old Kingdom, and the relative importance of medium properties reflected the generally higher level of cultivation. Nevertheless, there was a great disparity between large and small properties, a disparity intensified by the national question. The Rumanians were almost entirely peasants, and most of the large estates belonged to Hungarians. Reliable information, however, is lacking regarding the distribution of land either by size of property or by nationality; according to Hungarian critics of Rumanian statistics, no exact figures have ever been available for the land distribution in 1919 in the total area annexed by Rumania.[24] The Rumanians have claimed that they held only 24 per cent of the total area and that 98 per cent of the properties over 100 cadastral yokes (the yoke, used in Transylvania, equals .58 hectares) were held by non-Rumanians. While this claim may have been extreme, Hungarian sources grant that 87 per cent of the owners of properties exceeding 100 yokes were Magyars.

The project for the land reform, prepared in thirty-two sittings of the Governing Council, became a decree-law on September 12,

24. C. A. Macartney, *Hungary and Her Successors* (Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 316, n. 2.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

agricultural population in relation to the total agricultural land and the level of production was approaching a critical point.

To what extent was distribution a significant factor in overpopulation after the 1918–21 land reforms? To answer this question it is necessary to attempt an investigation of the effects of these reforms upon distribution.

The Distribution of Land [14]

Although the distribution of agricultural land in Rumania has been, if not the core of the agrarian question, at least the focus of attention, and although innumerable books, pamphlets, and articles have dealt with it, it is still difficult to provide a satisfactory picture of land distribution and impossible to give an exact account of its development in time. The incompleteness and irregularity of statistics, the intrusion of wars and the frequent changes of territorial boundaries, the unsettling effect of the agrarian reforms themselves, and on occasion the warping of figures to fit a political thesis have combined to obscure the real situation.

Before proceeding to an analysis of the available statistics it is necessary to be as clear as possible about the use of certain categories and definitions, since confusion over these has been the source of numerous erroneous conclusions. In particular it is indispensable to know what types of land are being included in the term "agricultural," and whether the distribution of land is on the basis of properties or of farming units.

During the interwar years the Rumanian Central Institute of Statistics came to classify land in the manner shown by the table on the following page (the 1936 areas of the respective types of land are included to indicate their comparative size).[15] Earlier Rumanian statistics frequently employed different classifications, and the inclusion or exclusion of pasture and woodland seriously alters the pattern of land distribution.

The second important distinction is between *properties*, based upon legal ownership of the land, and *exploitations*, defined in 1941 as "the area comprising all the land effectively cultivated under the direction and participation of the head of the exploitation." Exploitations and properties are obviously not identical, since an exploita-

14. For a more detailed discussion of the statistics of Rumanian land distribution see the Appendix.

15. Petre Onica, *Tehnica statisticii agricole*, Institutul Central de Statistică, Biblioteca Statistică, No. 9 (Bucarest, 1943), p. 17.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

				Hectares (in 1936)	*Per Cent*
Total area 29,505,000 hectares	A. Agricultural area	1.	Arable	13,940,000	47.3
		a.	Cereals	11,609,000	
		b.	Alimentary plants	532,000	
		c.	Industrial plants	493,000	
		d.	Cultivated or artificial meadows (forage crops)	783,000	
		e.	Fallow	523,000	
		2.	Natural meadows	1,410,000	4.7
		3.	Grazing and pasture	2,448,000	8.3
		4.	Vineyards	328,000	1.1
		5.	Orchards	233,000	0.8
	B. Nonagricultural area	1.	Woods and forests	6,449,000	21.9
		2.	Occupied land (yards, houses, streets and roads, cities, industrial and commercial land) and nonproductive	4,697,000	15.9

tion may be held on lease or in metayage. The statistics always show some difference between the two; in most cases large properties are more extensive than large exploitations, an indication that a portion of the large properties is being leased. A secondary distinction between privately owned and state or publicly owned properties is also important, and here again Rumanian statistics are often inconsistent.

Although official accounts of the results of the 1918–21 land reforms were issued by the Rumanian government, they are not a very reliable guide to the effect of these reforms on the distribution of agricultural property. About 6,000,000 hectares were reported to have been expropriated, of which about 3,900,000 hectares were distributed to some 1,393,000 peasants, or 69.5 per cent of those having a claim to land.[16] But while the land reform was supposed to have been completed around 1929–30, in 1940 it was officially announced that the reform was not yet terminated: 3,900 estates were still in possession of land which was to have been expropriated; 434,000 hectares of expropriated land had not even been surveyed for distribution; 440,000 hectares had not yet been divided; 900 law cases re-

16. Alexander Nasta, "La Réforme agraire en Roumanie," report presented to the Fourteenth Congress of the International Congress of Agriculture (Bucarest, June 7–10, 1929), p. 16; Biblioteca de Sociologie, Etică şi Politică, condusă de D. Gusti, *60 Sate romănești* (5 vols., Bucarest, 1941–43), II, 10.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

garding the agrarian reform still awaited adjudication.[17] This belated but damaging announcement naturally throws in doubt many of the earlier statistics which painfully calculated the final effects of the reform to two decimals.

Similarly, it is not possible to make any satisfactory comparisons between prereform and postreform figures, even for the Old Kingdom. The official estimates of the post-1921 situation, which have been generally used in most studies of Rumanian agriculture, are suspect: they merely subtracted from Creangă's estimate of large properties in 1905 the amount of land presumed to have been expropriated and added it to the area of small properties, a method taking no account of twenty years' unofficial changes in property relations. The results were naturally most impressive: large property had been reduced from 40 per cent of the agricultural area to 10 per cent, whereas small peasant properties, which had previously covered about 60 per cent of the land, now accounted for 90 per cent. This was undoubtedly an inflated estimate of the consequences of the reform.

Statistics available for the years between 1921 and 1945 do not, unfortunately, altogether clarify the picture. Between 1921 and 1929 there was both a progressive resettlement of peasants on land acquired through the reforms and a natural division and dispersion of properties through inheritance and, to a lesser degree, through sale. The only sources to give an indication of the results of these developments are some fiscal censuses prepared by the Ministry of Finance. Since these were gathered for tax purposes and employ different categories for dividing land holdings, they are not comparable with other available figures on land distribution. A comparison of the 1923 and 1928 censuses does, however, indicate certain trends. The number of agricultural taxpayers increased more rapidly than the extension of arable land, indicating an increasing density of agricultural population and a reduction of the average size of holdings from 3.6 hectares to 3.5 hectares.[18] There was a marked decline in the area of properties over 250 hectares, partly as a result of the continued application of the land reforms, although the increase in average size of properties between 50 and 250 hectares might mean that some of the land of large properties was falling into the hands of the larger peasant owners. The area of properties under 10 hectares and especially of those under 5 hectares increased greatly.

17. Quoted in Madgearu, *op. cit.*, p. 77, n. 1.

18. These censuses are discussed in *60 Sate romănești*, II, 12–15 and are given in the Appendix below.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

● 311 Although this increase may have been to some extent the result of the subdivision of holdings through inheritance, it was largely the reflection of allotments granted under the reform, since the situation in Bessarabia, which had completed its reform at an early date, was almost stationary, while there was a marked increase in the area of small properties in Transylvania, where the reform had been more gradually applied.

Only a very general summary of the distribution of land was published after the 1930 census, and even this summary is sufficiently ambiguous to prevent a comparison with earlier or later figures. According to this census, exploitations over 100 hectares in size still occupied almost 28 per cent of the total agricultural area (presumably also including some forest land) and nearly 15 per cent of the arable, the difference resulting from the high percentage of non-arable land possessed by large properties. Exploitations of less than 3 hectares, which amounted to 52 per cent of the total number, occupied less than 13 per cent of the total area and 16.5 per cent of the arable. Exploitations between 10 and 100 hectares occupied almost 25 per cent of the total agricultural area and over 25 per cent of the arable, a marked increase over the prewar situation in the Old Kingdom. This change reflects in part, however, the inclusion in the 1930 census of Transylvania and Bucovina, where medium holdings had been more numerous. In general, this census would show that large properties had not been reduced to the extent called for by the agrarian reforms, that holdings under 3 hectares still constituted the majority of the exploitations, and that medium holdings had increased in number and extent, although the agrarian reforms had made no provision for them.

The census of 1941 was the first careful attempt to analyze the distribution of land. Although its usefulness for present purposes is impaired by the omission of Bessarabia, Northern Bucovina, Northern Transylvania, and Southern Dobrogea, which had been lost in 1940, its summary results are the best information available. This census, which covered only individual and private exploitations, comprising 52 per cent of the total area of Rumania at that date, appears to show to an even greater extent the characteristics noted in the 1930 summary:

1) The group of exploitations and properties [19] between 3 and

19. The number of properties and exploitations were not identical for all categories; there were more properties than exploitations in holdings below 3 hectares and above 20 hectares, and more exploitations between 3 and 20 hectares. These differences merely reflect the fact that agricultural exploitations are not based solely on properties but also involve the use of property through lease or metayage.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED

5 hectares, which the 1918–21 land reforms considered as the basis of Rumanian agriculture in the allotment of land, actually constituted in 1941 only 19.5 per cent of the exploitations (18.4 per cent of the properties), occupying 16.4 per cent of the area of exploitations (16.1 per cent of the area of properties). On the other hand, exploitations under 3 hectares constituted 54.1 per cent of the total number (properties under 3 hectares constituted 58.4 per cent of the total number of properties).

2) The largest category of exploitations in terms of area was that between 5 and 10 hectares, i.e., above the average size for all holdings.

3) Despite the agrarian reforms, exploitations over 100 hectares occupied 14.2 per cent of the area; 8 per cent of the area was occupied by properties over 500 hectares.

Regionally, exploitations under one hectare were most numerous in mountainous districts and in industrial areas, where factory workers had small plots of land. Exploitations between one and 3 hectares were most common in the Carpathians and Bucovina. The large holdings were concentrated mainly in the southeast.

The 1941 census also provides the first comprehensive statistical picture of the way in which the land was farmed. More than 58 per cent of all exploitations properly speaking (that is, excluding the minute plots of land of less than one hectare of arable) were cultivated exclusively by family labor; and an additional 24.9 per cent utilized only part of the family's labor (the family also had recourse to other sources of income). Thus, 83 per cent of all exploitations proper were purely family cultivations. Exploitations using no family labor but employing workers, whether on a daily or yearly basis or in return for a piece of land, accounted for only 1.5 per cent of the total, although they covered 12.1 per cent of the land. For the most part these exploitations represented the residues of the expropriated estates. The fourth category, using both family and employed labor, represented intensive peasant farms, and comprised 15.3 per cent of the number of exploitations and 24.8 per cent of the area.

Over 71 per cent of the exploitations were owned by the cultivator, 28 per cent included additional land held in lease or metayage, and less than one per cent of the exploitations were entirely on rented land. If these criteria are combined with those above, the most prevalent form of peasant cultivation, accounting for 41.6 per cent of all exploitations proper, was one owned in its entirety by the cultivator and employing only family labor.

Unfortunately, the information on agricultural labor in 1941 has

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

not been fully organized and published. According to a statistical bulletin issued in 1947, on the 2,300,000 odd agricultural exploitations in 1941, 813,546 "members of families," after completing work on their own holding, worked for others, either for money or for produce. Of these, 748,821 worked in the same village and 64,725 took the road to work in other villages. On September 1, 1940, there were 191,199 permanently hired agricultural workers, of whom 103,353 were men, 68,325 women, and 19,521 children. As might be expected, the practice of seeking additional work was most extensive in the Carpathian regions of Oltenia and Muntenia, where for every 100 family exploitations, 50 members of families sought work, as against 35.3 for all Rumania. The same area had the least number of permanent hired workers, 4.7 per 100 exploitations as against 8.3 for all Rumania.[20]

The general results of the 1941 census, as published thus far, do not correlate size of exploitation with type of labor and holding. However, a special study for the judeţ of Argeş, "which by the variety of the soil and the nature of the exploitations constitutes one of the most representative judeţe of our country," [21] gives such a correlation, which may be a fair sample for all of Rumania. This correlation is what might be expected. Large farms, especially those over 100 hectares, were cultivated mainly by hired labor. Farms between 10 and 50 hectares were most frequently cultivated by a combination of family and hired labor. Peasant farms between 1 and 5 hectares used only family labor, and in about one-third of the cases the labor of the family was not completely utilized. Cultivators with holdings of less than one hectare fell into the class of agricultural laborers.

What conclusions may be drawn from these scattered and not altogether comparable figures regarding: (a) the effect of the agrarian reforms upon the distribution of land; (b) land distribution as a cause of agricultural overpopulation; (c) trends in land distribution during the interwar period?

(a) While there is no doubt that the agrarian reforms of 1918–21 greatly reduced the amount of land held by property owners of over 100 hectares, they did not bring about the virtual disappearance of large landed estates, as was so often proclaimed in the years after the First World War. In 1941 properties over 100 hectares still

20. Institutul Central de Statistică, *Comunicari statistice Nr. 16, 15 ianuarie 1947*, p. 3. In 1930 the Rumanian National Bank estimated that there were 464,000 agricultural workers, 16.7 per cent of the total agricultural active population of 2,773,769. *60 Sate româneşti*, II, 18.

21. Roman Cresin, *Agricultura din Judeţul Argeş* (Bucarest, 1945), p. 11.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

occupied over 16 per cent of the privately owned land.[22] The extent of leasing and cultivation in metayage decreased considerably, however, and reflected the reduction of differences in the size of properties. As has been seen in the first chapter, before the First World War leasing and subleasing in a variety of forms was extremely widespread in the Old Kingdom. While the 1941 statistics do not present a clear picture of the exact amount of land let out, 71.8 per cent of the exploitations proper were owned by their cultivators, and only 0.4 per cent were cultivated entirely by tenants or in metayage. Of the 225,890 hectares covered by the census in the judeţ of Argeş, only 21,591 were rented. Properties in Argeş let out by their owners in rent or in metayage comprised 9.5 per cent of the total area of properties and 16.2 per cent of the arable terrain. These percentages are somewhat higher than the estimate made by the Rumanian Ministry of Finance in 1927 that 8.4 per cent of the land (based on taxpayers) in the Old Kingdom was let out.[23]

The agrarian reforms were not successful, however, in creating a satisfactory peasant agriculture based upon small properties of between 3 and 5 hectares.[24] In 1941 over 58 per cent of the properties were below 3 hectares, a perilous minimum for a self-sustaining cultivation; properties between 3 and 5 hectares amounted to only 18.4 per cent of the total number and covered only 16 per cent of the area. The reasons for this failure will be discussed shortly.

(b) The unequal distribution of land was not a primary cause of agrarian overpopulation during the interwar period. The 1941 census does not provide decisive evidence on this question, as it covered only a little over half the total area of Rumania in its 1941 frontiers. It included, however, over 87 per cent of the total arable, and is therefore fairly reliable as regards cultivable land. According to this census, the average size of all properties under 5 hectares was

22. This figure, it must be repeated, is not comparable with the pre-1914 figures. In the first place, geographical area is not the same. Moreover, Creangă in his 1905 estimate included state and public properties and grazing land but excluded forests. The 1941 census included whatever forest and grazing land was owned privately but omitted communal and state controlled pastures and forests.

23. Quoted in Mitrany, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania*, p. 246.

24. In 1945 the Danish agricultural economist, M. Gormsen, who had been employed by the Rumanian government, stated that in its practical consequences, "the transformation of estate land into peasant land in Rumania in 1918–1921 meant in spite of everything only the continuation on a much larger scale of the old short-sighted policy of the past. This policy consisted in leaving as little land as possible to the peasants without taking into consideration whether it was sufficient or not for a rational and independent peasant agriculture." M. Gormsen, *Short Introduction to the Principal Structural Problems of the Agriculture in Roumania* (Bucarest, 1945), p. 40.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

2.0 hectares. If all land in excess of 100 hectares were distributed to properties below 5 hectares, their average size would rise to 2.7 hectares; if all property in excess of 50 hectares, the average size would be 2.9 hectares. (This computation does not, of course, take into account regional differences in land distribution, which would considerably reduce the gains to small properties unless the farm population were far more mobile than it has been in the past.) Actually, the increase in arable would be less than the figures indicate because a fairly large proportion of big properties was forest land. In Argeş, for example, although it has more forest land than most judeţe, forests accounted for 57.1 per cent of the land of exploitations over 100 hectares, and 40. 9 per cent of the land of exploitations between 50 and 100 hectares.[25] According to a sampling of a number of villages throughout Rumania, 26 per cent of the land of properties over 25 hectares was forest.[26]

In short, while a further redistribution of the land would have some effect in increasing the size of peasant holdings and would provide a temporary relief for a number of peasants, it could not in itself remedy, even temporarily, the more fundamental problems connected with agricultural overpopulation. This point must be born in mind in connection with the land reform of 1945, to be discussed in a later chapter.

(c) While the changes in land distribution during the interwar period are not altogether clear, one principal development is discernible. Properties between 3 and 5 hectares, which are statistically the average size, failed to become the predominant type of holding. Instead, there appears to have been an increase in the number of submarginal holdings under 3 hectares and in the extent of medium peasant properties between 5 and 20 hectares. In the judeţ of Argeş, the renting of supplementary land was most widespread in exploitations between 5 and 10 hectares and between 10 and 20 hectares, a fact which would indicate relative economic strength. In 1940, Madgearu observed that after 1929 there had been a strengthening of middle properties on the one hand and the formation of an agricultural proletariat on the other.[27]

The investigation of sixty villages in 1938 showed in what way land reform contributed to this development. According to this sampling, the initial effect of the agrarian reform had been a leveling of the difference between poor and rich peasant households, an effect

25. Roman Cresin, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
26. *Sate romdnesti*, II, 49.
27. Madgearu, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

more marked in the plains than in the mountains. However, the evolution of the two categories of peasant households—those which had received land under the reform and those which had not—was quite different. Holdings which had been either created or supplemented by allotments under the agrarian reform had a much lower resistance to the process of fragmentation of land than the nonallotted holdings; sale of holdings was more frequent among peasants who had received land by the reform.[28] The conclusion is that the agrarian reforms had not established the new properties on a firm basis, which would enable the poor peasant to maintain himself, and had only temporarily checked a tendency toward inequality in the village.

In general, the unequal distribution of land, as a purely economic factor, was not the primary cause for the agrarian difficulties of the interwar period. For a more complete explanation of these difficulties it is necessary to turn to the question of agricultural productivity and the relations of agriculture to the whole of the Rumanian economy.

Agricultural Production[29]

During the interwar years Rumanian agriculture was still largely devoted to the cultivation of cereal crops, which in 1938 occupied 82.1 per cent of the total arable surface:[30]

	In 1,000 hectares	*Per cent of arable*
Total arable	13,873.8	100.0
Cereals	11,387.3	82.1
Wheat	3,926.9	28.3
Maize	5,033.6	36.3
Barley	1,250.8	9.0
Oats	648.7	4.7
Rye	478.3	3.4
Alimentary plants	494.3	3.6
Industrial plants	487.6	3.5
Forage crops	734.3	5.3
Fallow	770.3	5.6

A slight shift in emphasis occurred during this period; the percentage of arable land under cereals dropped from 87 to 82 per cent, although the area under the principal grains, wheat and maize, in-

28. *60 Sate romînești*, II, 33, 41.

29. Statistical material supporting and illustrating the conclusions of this section is included in the Appendix.

30. *Statistica agricolă a României în 1938*, p. 2.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

INDEX OF AREA, YIELD, AND PRODUCTION OF CEREALS[32]

(1909–13 = 100)

	1909–13	1920	1922	1924	1925	1926	1933–37
Area	100	84.4	94.5	101.2	103.5	102.8	114.3
Yield	100	86.7	77.5	60.0	71.7	99.2	81.7
Production	100	72.9	73.6	60.6	74.6	101.6	93.1

In the discussion of overpopulation it was seen that the productivity per hectare in Rumania was exceedingly low. For the four-year period 1928–32 the Rumanian wheat yield was below that of any Balkan state except Greece, averaging 9.5 quintals per hectare, as contrasted with a French yield of 14.8 and a Danish yield of 29.4 quintals per hectare during the same years. Although the Rumanian peasant has been more successful with maize, his output of that grain is also very low. This low rate of yield has been the most striking symptom of the unhealthy condition of Rumanian agriculture. The records of the past half century give little evidence of improvement, and there has been a noticeable decline in comparison with the pre-1914 figures.

Technical and material factors provide an immediate explanation for Rumania's poor output, but beyond these are more general causes which inhibit the improvement of agriculture and the introduction of more efficient techniques. On the whole, physical conditions in Rumania do not prevent a satisfactory agriculture. The hilly regions are somewhat deficient in humus but the soil of the plains is unusually fertile. The plains are exposed to extremes of rainfall and temperature, and the irregularity of the rainfall, the most serious threat to crops, is conducive to a wide fluctuation in output. Nevertheless, these conditions would present no serious obstacle to an increase in production if farming methods were adapted to the soil and climate.[33]

The principal material reasons for the low productivity are the extremely limited use of manure and fertilizers, absence of which is causing gradual depletion of the soil, even in the best plains regions; the lack of moisture-conserving measures; a primitive crop-rotation system; the low quality of livestock; backward techniques of cultivation and the shortage of agricultural equipment; and the prevalence of strip farming. The two last points require additional explanation.

32. League of Nations, *Agricultural Production in Continental Europe* (1943), p. 73.
33. U.S. Department of Agriculture, *op. cit.*, p. 715.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

241
● 31

The low level of productivity is clearly a function of the investment in agricultural inventory, which is exceptionally small in Rumania:[34]

	Value of agricultural inventory in lei/hectare	*Average production of wheat in kilograms/hectare*
Rumania	1,000	860
Bulgaria	2,000	1,320
Poland	3,000	1,440
Germany	15,000	2,070
Switzerland	42,000	2,250

While there is a great dearth of investment in agricultural equipment, there is also an overinvestment in certain items because of the large number of small holdings, each with its primitive inventory. According to the 1941 census on agricultural equipment—the first adequate estimate—though there was less than one plough to every two exploitations, there was one plough for every seven hectares of arable land. But since one plough was capable, according to Rumanian estimates, of turning over fifteen hectares, there were about twice as many ploughs as were necessary in terms of technical requirements.[35]

The division of agricultural exploitations into numerous small plots or strips is, of course, intimately related to the question of agrarian reform and to the pressure of population, although strip farming was prevalent before 1918. The agrarian reforms contributed to its extension, not only because they omitted any provisions for consolidation, but also because the land of the expropriated estates was usually divided into a number of small, narrow strips of land of from ½ to 5 hectares, which were given either to landless peasants or to those with inadequate holdings. These strips were often several kilometers away from the peasant's village or his other holdings. In 1941 the average area of all exploitations was 4.5 hectares, with an average of 5 plots per exploitation. Frequently these plots

34. Madgearu, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

35. Census of agricultural equipment, 1941 (*Recensământul agricol din 1941*, p. 56):

	Number	*Number per 100 exploitations*	*Number per 100 hectares arable land*
Ploughs	1,083,018	48.0	14.5
Harrows	752,063	33.3	10.0
Seed drills	58,589	2.6	0.8
Reapers	39,345	1.7	0.5
Tractors	8,416	0.4	0.1
Carts	1,191,254	52.7	15.7

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

of less than one hectare were several hundred meters long and only 5 to 10 meters wide. The strips were at a great distance from one another, some authorities estimating the average distance to be from 4 to 7 kilometers.[36] The division of farming units into such small strips is obviously an impediment to any rationalization of agriculture.

Primitive techniques and irrational organization of holdings, while directly responsible for low productivity, are really manifestations rather than causes of the stagnation of Rumanian agriculture. What has inhibited the introduction of technical and organizational improvements? Poverty and "lack of capital" merely describe the situation; they do not explain it. Nor can this stagnation be ascribed to the natural inertia of a primitive agricultural society: the Rumanian economy has been in the midst of a dynamic process of change for over a century.

The fall in yield after the agrarian reforms of 1918–21 naturally raised the question whether the expropriation of the large estates was responsible for the critical state of Rumanian farming. This question is likely to be misleading if it is reduced to a comparison of the theoretical merits of large scale and peasant agriculture. Criticism that the agrarian reforms are responsible for the decline in agricultural productivity is apt to assume that the pre-1914 estates were well-organized large farms, whereas for the most part they were latifundiary cultivations, farmed out to the peasants who cultivated them with their own animals and equipment.[37] To be sure, some of the large farms were relatively well managed (although the yield even on the big estates was low in comparison with western European standards), and it may be that certain other controls employed by the large farms—notably the selection of seed and the regulation of the date at which sowing should begin [38]—were sufficient to account for the higher yield of the large properties. During the interwar years, as before 1914, large farms continued to have a higher cereal

36. M. Gormsen, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

37. For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in a study of Rumanian agriculture, cites the great annual fluctuation in the wheat yield, a result of the variation in rainfall, as an example of the inability of the small peasant to take appropriate moisture conservation measures. "Managers of the large estates knew how to overcome this handicap to a considerable extent." U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, *op. cit.*, p. 715. A comparison of pre-1914 yields, however, indicates that while the yield of large properties was higher than that of small properties, the fluctuation in yield was practically the same for both categories. Cf. Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

38. Doreen Warriner, *The Economics of Peasant Farming* (Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 153.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

241 yield than the small peasant holdings,[39] though there appear to be
311 no satisfactory statistics on this point.

On the other hand, defenders of the agrarian reform and small peasant properties have tended to assume that the Rumanian small holder was on his way to becoming an independent peasant proprietor, a doubtful assumption in view of the prevalence of dwarf holdings and the continued excessive cultivation of cereals. In 1937 G. Ionescu-Sișești and N. Cornățeanu upheld the reform and peasant farming on the following grounds:

The reform was an economic necessity under the conditions of devastation after the First World War; it was only by giving land to the peasants that they were induced to make the great effort necessary for agricultural recovery. Peasant farming became more intensive and less devoted to cereal cultivation. The peasant was better able to withstand agricultural crises, largely because the large farmer lacked his ability to reduce expenses and increase family labor. Finally, peasant agriculture should not be judged in terms of its contribution to the national income but by its ability to "assure the existence of the greatest possible number of citizens." It is therefore erroneous to "establish a comparison between peasant agriculture and the system of large property." [40]

311 The necessity of the agrarian reforms need not be argued, although
185 they could be defined more convincingly as a social than as an economic imperative (i.e., the peasants would have refused to continue to work under the old system). It may also be true that peasant farming cannot be judged by narrow profit-and-loss accounting methods, since it is a manner of living as well as a form of livelihood. But Sișești's and Cornățeanu's supporting arguments do not appear relevant to the actual Rumanian situation. There is no indication that peasant cultivation did become to any significant degree more intensive and varied. The examples they give, taken from a survey of a number of farms between 1930 and 1934, to illustrate the viability of peasant farming are not representative but comprise farms well above the average size for Rumania. Hence the real problem of dwarf holdings is avoided. The argument that small holdings are more resistant to crises because the peasant is able to restrict his consumption and increase family labor is not altogether reassuring in face of the growing pressure of population, regardless of its dubi-

[113] 39. M. Gormsen, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
40. G. Ionescu-Sișești and N. Cornățeanu, *La Réforme agraire en Roumanie et ses conséquences* (Bucarest, 1937), pp. 42–53.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

ous merits from the point of view of social welfare. The effort to ignore the importance of national income as a criterion for judging the advantages of peasant farming is unrealistic, given the existence of a modern Rumanian state with its manifold requirements. Finally, for all their optimism, Sișești and Cornățeanu admit the serious menace of continued subdivision of the land and urge the creation of a "peasant bourgeoisie." They do not indicate, however, what is to become of the poor peasants displaced in such a creation except to appeal for a further expansion of a national industry. The appeal to national industry, as a *deus ex machina*, at once undermines the whole argument for the viability of the Rumanian peasant proprietor.

Actually, such discussions of the merits and defects of peasant agriculture have only a limited relevance in Rumania. For example, in a study of 275 peasant households made in 1938, it was discovered that in general both the gross income per hectare (the total agricultural product of the holding, whether consumed or sold) and the agricultural income per hectare (gross income minus expenses for agriculture—labor payments, inventory, buildings, seed, etc.) tended to be higher on the small (under 3 hectares) than on the larger holdings. This higher net yield would appear to substantiate the contentions of the advocates of small farming.[41] In fact, however, the majority of the small holdings in this investigation operated at a deficit because the consumption needs of the household, largely food and clothing, were greater than the farm could produce. Only 14 per cent of the holdings between 1 and 3 hectares had an agricultural income greater than consumption, whereas in 86 per cent of the cases consumption was greater. Only 30 per cent of the holdings between 3 and 5 hectares had agricultural incomes greater than consumption. On the larger farms, between 10 and 20 hectares, 59 per cent had an agricultural income sufficient to meet consumption needs.[42] Therefore, the relative net incomes of farms of different sizes were of less

41. This higher rate of agricultural income among the small holdings is not, as it might appear, in contradiction to the statement that the cereal yield is higher on large farms than on small. A much smaller proportion of the income of the small holdings is derived from cereals; most of it comes from the sale of animals, fowls, fruits, etc. This, however, does not really represent a turn to intensive farming, since it is conducted on a very primitive level and only reflects the dwarf holder's efforts to maintain himself at a subsistence level.

42. *60 Sate românești*, II, 292. It should be noted that this investigation did not include large farms but only peasant holdings up to 40 hectares. Moreover, the results of the investigation showed an extremely wide range of variation, both regionally and among farms of the same size. Hence, the sampling may not have been extensive enough to permit confident generalization.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

311
185

importance than the fact that the general level of productivity was so low that a great number of the small farms simply did not produce enough to support themselves.

The effect of the 1918–21 land reforms upon production is also obscured by the numerous other factors which worked to reduce output: the destruction caused by the First World War, the economic policy of the postwar governments, the agrarian crisis and the "price scissors" of the 1930's.[43] While one cannot dismiss the effect of the redistribution of land as of only historical interest, since the leading feature of the 1945 agrarian reform was a further expropriation of large properties, it should be stressed that the reforms of 1918–21 were passed because of a pressing political and social necessity for a redistribution of the land; they were not primarily designed to increase production, and whatever their effect upon yield, it should be regarded as incidental to the aims of the reforms.

In general, it seems fair to say that the redistribution of land in Rumania—except in so far as it contributed to a further extension of uneconomic strip farming—had only a marginal direct effect upon productivity. The decline in yield, even if it was caused by the expropriation of the large estates, was only a modest contribution to the generally low level of Rumanian productivity. A comparison with the yield per hectare in neighboring countries reveals that states with more extensive large properties than Rumania (Hungary and Poland) as well as states in which small holdings predominated (Bulgaria and Yugoslavia) all had a yield well below that of western and central Europe.[44]

If the reforms of 1918–21 failed to bring about a more efficient organization of Rumanian agriculture, what were the principal organizational defects which, by preventing the introduction of more rational techniques, maintained a low level of productivity?

A Danish agricultural economist, M. Gormsen, who came to Rumania in 1939 at the request of the Rumanian government, has made

43. For an extensive discussion of these factors and their effect upon productivity to 1930 see Mitrany, *op. cit.*, pp. 306–331.

44. Moore, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, 82.

	Per cent of land held in undertakings of over 50 ha. (*ca.* 1930)	*Yield in crop units per ha.*
Rumania	32.2	17
Hungary	51.3	21
Poland	47.3	18
Bulgaria	1.6	19
Yugoslavia	9.7	17
Europe (excluding U.S.S.R.)		24

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

a useful distinction between "agrarian reforms," which affect the organization of farming, and "agricultural reforms," which seek to improve the techniques.[45] In his opinion the agrarian reforms must be applied first or the agricultural reforms will be fruitless. Moreover, agrarian reforms can be carried out only by some superior body, such as the state, as the result of a conscious act of decision, whereas agricultural reforms are more gradual and can be applied by the farmers themselves. Among the main agrarian reforms indispensable for a prosperous agriculture he would include:

1) The abolition of servile relations—binding the peasant to the land, forced labor, feudal property relations, tithes, and the common utilization of the land. This reform was achieved in principle by the emancipation of 1864.

2) The transformation of estate land into peasant land. This was largely achieved by the reforms of 1918–21. Gormsen feels that a further transfer would yield positive but limited benefits.

3) The consolidation of individual peasant farms and, as a corollary, the partial evacuation of the villages and the establishment of farmhouses on the consolidated holdings. Gormsen regards this as the most important reform still to be carried out in Rumania.

4) The limitation of divisibility and expansion of holdings, to prevent the undoing of consolidation.

5) The introduction of a land register, definite property demarcations, and enclosures if necessary.

Under agricultural reforms he would include all such measures as the rationalization of farming methods; soil, seed, and livestock improvement; organization of agricultural credit and cooperation; the development of experimental stations; and so on.

In Gormsen's opinion, the Rumanian governments between the wars made the very serious mistake of devoting all their attention to efforts, often quite expensive, to introduce agricultural reforms. These were of little permanent value so long as the necessary agrarian reforms had not been made. An example is the complete failure of attempts to establish agricultural credit and peasant cooperatives, which have been the perennial promise of every new Rumanian government.

An effective permanent system of organized credit for peasant agriculture in Rumania does not exist although a number of institutions have been created from time to time to that purpose, as a rule with the assistance of the state or the national bank, but they only worked for a

45. M. Gormsen, *op. cit.*

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

many's increasing monopoly over Rumanian trade and hoped to keep the door open for other markets.[23]

Apart from these important qualifications, however, he expressed his approval of Germany's program for Rumania, the intensification of agriculture, the creation of agricultural industries, and the establishment of mixed companies for mining and petroleum. In general, he seems to have regarded Rumania's increasing economic ties with Germany as largely in the nature of things and only secondarily as a result of policy: "This situation is not so much the result of a crystallization of policy as a change in the structure of the Rumanian economy, which gradually with the advance of the process of industrialization diminished the degree of complementarity with a series of countries and increased it with regard to one alone—Germany."[24]

Although it may seem surprising that the German policy embodied in the agreement of March, 1939, should have more in common with the economic aims of a National Peasant than with a pro-Axis corporatist, the reason is obvious. The National Peasants, believing in economic interdependence and the international division of labor, disapproved of fostering Rumanian industry at the expense of agriculture.[25] Germany, for its own reasons, desired the Balkans to increase their agricultural production and to stay away from secondary industries. On the other hand, Manoilescu's industrial ambitions were unwelcome to the Germans because of their similarity to German aims, a case of like poles repelling. This antagonism arising out of an attempt at similarity is a characteristic of Rumanian history. The earlier effort of the Liberals to emulate the West had led to the economic xenophobia of the Brătianus.

The success of the German-Rumanian agreement could have been measured only after a number of years of peaceful development; it may be doubted whether the results anticipated could have been achieved in the five years of the agreement. But such a peaceful period was not to be granted. In the year after the inauguration of the five-year plan Rumania had lost one third of its territory, Carol had fled the country, and Marshal Antonescu had joined Hitler's war against the Soviet Union. The territorial losses alone severely disorganized the economic program. By the loss of Bessarabia, Northern Bucovina, Northern Transylvania, and Southern Dobrogea Rumania was deprived of 34 per cent of its total area, 37 per cent of the arable land,

23. Madgearu, *Evoluția economiei românești*, pp. 372–374.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 301.

25. For somewhat analogous reasons, at the time of the First World War several Rumanian populists had been pro-German because they saw Germany as the industrial complement to Rumania's agrarian society.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951. EDI Rumania EDI

311 433 44 per cent of the forest land, 27 per cent of the orchards, and 37 per cent of the vineyards. Of the area devoted to wheat (as of 1939) it lost 37 per cent, to maize 30 per cent, to sunflower 75 per cent, to hemp 48 per cent, and 86 per cent of the area devoted to soya. The regions, chiefly Bessarabia, in which the new industrial crops had been most intensively cultivated were lost. Finally, the whole economy was put on a war footing, first for Germany and then for Rumania itself.

185 433 Notwithstanding all Carol's laws and decrees, no real solutions were found to the agrarian question. It is illuminating to look through the volumes of the *Enciclopedia României*, published in the last years of Carol's reign as a monument to the Rumanian rebirth. Amid all the fanfare of Rumania's marvelous progress and glowing future, the articles on agriculture and land tenure strike a discordant and often deeply pessimistic note.

To be sure, the trend in the 1930's was toward increasing industrialization as the solution to Rumania's economic difficulties, and in the long run, had the war not intervened, this might have brought beneficial results even to agriculture. As it was, however, much of the industrialization was achieved at the expense of agriculture, and for all its expansion it was neither bringing agriculture any great technical improvements nor beginning to absorb the excess agricultural population. The five-year plan and the laws to rationalize land tenure and consolidate holdings might have provided a healthier foundation for agriculture had they been carried out conscientiously, but there is little evidence that they meant anything more than many previous legislative acts which clutter the Rumanian statute books. It is doubtful whether the peasant would have benefited greatly from a plan ordained by divine providence if it had been left to the Carol administration to execute it. With all its attacks on "outworn" parties and its praise for the younger generation, the Carol dictatorship lacked the stature to be a modernizing dictatorship along the lines of Kemal Ataturk's regime. The new German orientation might have benefited Rumanian agriculture, but given the power relations it is more likely that Rumania would have become the object of an efficient colonial policy.

654 Among the social studies undertaken in the period of Carol's dictatorship there was one which makes a fitting conclusion to the Carolist period, and indeed illustrates the failure to master the agrarian question during the interwar years. In the summer and autumn of 1939 a Rumanian research team made a field study of the *plasă* (an administrative unit in a judeţ) Dâmbovnicul, in the south of the

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

judeţ of Argeş.[26] This plasă was selected and is of interest for a number of reasons. It lay midway between the Carpathians and the Danube Valley and was in the heart of Wallachia. Having closer communications than many regions with roads leading to the capital, it had long been under the commercial influences which have so profoundly affected Rumanian society; it was not a primitive untouched district but was showing the full effect of what the investigators called "Americanization." Its population was almost entirely Rumanian and almost entirely devoted to agriculture. It lay near Răteşti, the family estate of the Brătianus, and Topoloveni, Mihalache's town, and had consequently received a good deal of attention from the parties in their political campaigns. Hence, Dâmbovnicul, if not the average Rumanian plasă, was an excellent representative of an agricultural community of the Old Kingdom and displayed the principal problems peculiar to Rumania.

What were the conditions in this community in the summer of 1939? Over nine-tenths of the population was engaged in agriculture; in the remaining tenth there were more public officials than merchants, tradesmen, or artisans. Of the 9,400 heads of families, about two-thirds (6,681) were cultivators on their own land or estate owners; 772 worked the land in dijma, that is, under the old crop-sharing tenure; 571 were agricultural day laborers, 144 were farm hands, and only 30 were tenants. About 87 per cent of the land was agricultural; forests which had once been extensive had by this time been reduced below the local needs for firewood and timber. Wheat, maize, and oats occupied almost three-fourths of the arable land.

The density of agricultural population was somewhat below the average for Rumania, but there were just under 70 inhabitants dependent upon agriculture per square kilometer of agricultural land. Evidence of overpopulation was seen in the use of practically all the land for cereals, the small size of exploitations, and in the search for auxiliary sources of income. About 23 per cent of the families had less than one hectare of land, and 56 per cent less than 3 hectares. These small holdings were further subdivided into numerous strips; the properties between one and three hectares, for example, were composed on the average of 6 plots of .3 hectares each. For the level of cultivation in this region, 4–5 hectares were the minimum adequate to feed a family of 4–5 members, but only 22 per cent of the properties were over 5 hectares. Competition for land was intense, the terms for land worked in dijma were becoming increasingly severe,

26. Mihai Pop and A. Golopenţia, *Dâmbovnicul, o plasă din sudul Judeţului Argeş* (Bucarest, 1942).

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

and the investigators found many of the old labor contracts and obligations associated with pre-1914 Rumania.

Unable to support themselves in the community, many peasants were seeking temporary work in nearby market towns, and a number traveled as far as Bucarest, a distance of about 70 kilometers. The exodus in most cases was not permanent, and the peasants after earning some money returned to Dâmbovnicul. This movement to the city was a reflection of the new conditions, which were also seen in the houses and garments of the peasants: houses were no longer built to last generations as was the case in the more isolated districts to the north; the national costume was relegated to Sundays. Birth and death rates were high and the natural increase outran the emigration away from the plasă. The standard of living was very low; many families were undernourished.

A definite differentiation in the peasantry was developing. A few peasants—mostly those who had inherited medium properties—were enlarging their holdings; a few new peasant estates of over 100 hectares had been created. The poorer peasants, including many who had been allotted land, were losing their holdings. Investigations into debts and credit showed that even after the conversion of 1934 about half the households were in debt. Credit provided by the cooperative banks went almost entirely to the larger peasants; in one commune holdings of up to 5 hectares received only 7.9 per cent of the loans. The special political interest shown by the parties in the judeţ of Argeş seemed to have brought no benefits beyond permitting local party stalwarts to obtain extra funds to purchase land from peasants who were in debt or in need of money.

Such, then, was the land of happy peasants with their colorful folkways so picturesquely displayed in the travel literature of the Carolist era.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

aged by five trustees; the Ministry of Agriculture was to supervise its business transactions, and technical and administrative control lay in the hands of the chief of the agricultural district. Members were obliged to conform to the requirements of the government crop plan. It was reported in 1944 that about 200 such associations had been established.[19]

This law did not really represent anything new in Rumania but was merely one of the various measures which had been applied from time to time to overcome the agrarian impasse. It represents, however, a somewhat different approach from that emphasized by either the National Peasants or the Carolist dictatorship. The National Peasants had placed greatest stress upon credit, cooperatives, and diversification of production, with a view to creating the small peasant on the Western model. The Carolist regime, in its activities of 1938 and 1939, was aiming at consolidation and the creation of middle properties. The law of 1942 was an attempt to improve the situation on the basis of existing circumstances, of utilizing in the most efficient way possible the uneconomic system of land holdings. To be sure, all the approaches overlapped somewhat, but in a way the 1942 act was a bridge to the agricultural policy of the post-1945 government.

The Germans, for their own reasons, were anxious to develop Rumanian agriculture as part of the economy of the new order, although their estimate of what could be achieved in Rumanian agriculture was relatively modest. A wartime analysis by some German experts[20] presented a very dismal picture of Rumanian farming as of 1940. According to their report the principal difficulties lay in the low yield resulting from the small size of the majority of the holdings (they noted that most of the large properties were cultivated in metayage) and in the inadequacy of the transport system, both the general network and the village roads. They doubted whether agriculture itself

19. Otto von Franges, "Agricultural Labour Communities in South Eastern Europe," *International Review of Agriculture, 35* (January–February, 1944), 22E–32E. Von Franges was heartily in favor of these associations, of which similar types had been established in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. In his opinion they corresponded to traditional labor associations of the Balkan peasants and showed an admirable balance between individualism and collectivism, between control and liberty. He sharply contrasted these associations with agricultural cooperatives. The latter, while having a useful function, were obliged to neglect the poorer peasant. The associations, he felt, were the only possible compensation for the fragmentation of peasant properties and the only means of obtaining a decent improvement of productivity until the slow process of consolidation could take place.

20. H. L. Fensch and O. Thiel, *Rumänien, Untersuchung über die Betriebs- und Ernährungswirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse der Landwirtschaft.* (I have seen only a manuscript Rumanian translation of this study.)

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

was in any position to remedy either of these defects. They had hopes, however, that measures—such as those taken in 1942—of compensating for inefficient small holdings by means of common use of machines, purchase of seed, and organization of sale could bring some improvements. They believed that under existing circumstances it would be possible to increase agricultural production by 25 per cent over ten years and that some 40 per cent of the surplus of cereals and vegetables would be available for export to Germany.

The actual course of Rumanian agriculture during the war showed no such progress. The area devoted to cereals fell appreciably between 1940 and 1943 because of the labor shortage, the decline in livestock and equipment, and the price controls which held cereal prices well below industrial prices.[21] Yields fell off in the principal grains, maize and wheat. The total production of cereals dropped from a 1935–39 average of 75.7 million quintals (for the area as of January, 1941) to 61–64 million (38 million in 1942 following an exceptionally severe winter).[22] Because of war needs the area devoted to industrial and food crops increased, in most cases as the result of government support and crop plans. It was still very small, however, compared with that under cereals. In livestock the greatest reduction, as was to be expected, was in horses; cattle increased somewhat; sheep, goats, and pigs remained about the same.

The number of draft animals declined by one-third, though the most serious fall was between 1943 and the beginning of 1945; that is, at the time of the final military collapse when both German and Soviet troops were on Rumanian soil. There was a notable increase in the number of tractors (from 4,170 in 1940 to 8,340 in 1943 and 8,178 in 1945), although in the opinion of the Central Institute of Statistics it did not compensate for the decline in draft animals which were the only feasible form of traction on the small strip farms.[23]

21. Area devoted to cereals, 48 judeţe (area as of January, 1941):

	Millions of hectares
1935–39	7.4
1940	6.8
1941	6.6
1942	6.4
1943	6.6

Source: Institutul Central de Statistică, *Statistica agricolă a României în 1941–1944* (Bucarest, 1947), p. xiii.

22. According to the Central Institute of Statistics, *ibid.*, p. xv, the recorded figures for production may have been well below the actual production because of extensive and often irregular army requisitioning; the wheat crop may have been underestimated by 20 per cent, the maize crop by 10 per cent.

23. Institutul Central de Statistică, *Statistica agricolă a României, Vol. V, Inventarul agricol în Anul 1945* (Bucarest, 1947), p. 14.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

● 311 TABLE VIII. DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY IN THE OLD KINGDOM, 1907

Categories (hectares)	Number of Holdings	Per Cent of Total Properties	Area (hectares)	Per Cent of Total Area
0–½ ha.	62,332	6.60	26,426	0.34
½–1	81,089	8.50	72,757	0.98
1–2	147,900	15.20	237,029	3.01
2–3	131,630	13.60	337,000	4.30
3–4	172,446	17.90	631,964	8.08
4–5	148,717	15.40	711,033	9.08
5–7	131,145	13.50	743,486	9.50
7–10	45,230	4.70	393,950	5.05
Total, 0–10 ha.	920,989	95.40	3,153,645	40.29
10–50	36,318	3.70	695,953	8.89
50–100	2,405	0.26	166,847	2.13
100–500	3,314	0.41	816,385	10.43
500–1,000	1,122	0.13	803,084	10.26
1,000–3,000	771	0.09	1,236,420	15.80
3,000–5,000	112	0.01	434,367	5.55
Over 5,000	66	0.00	520,095	6.65
Total	965,047	100.00	7,826,796	100.00

SOURCE: G. D. Creangă, *Grundbesitzverteilung und Bauernfrage in Rumänien*, in *Staats- und sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungen*, Heft 129 (Leipzig, 1907), p. 93.

COMMENT: This table includes private properties, land owned by religious and other public foundations, state land, and crown domains. With regard to type of land, it includes arable, meadows, and pasture, but not vineyards, orchards, or forests. Creangă estimated that there were in Rumania some 74,000 hectares of orchards and 98,000 hectares of vineyards, belonging mostly to small holders, and 2,422,000 hectares of forest (not including swamp land), belonging almost entirely to large proprietors, either public or private. His figure for the area of holdings under 10 hectares is too low, as it was based on data from 1896, and about 153,000 hectares of state land were distributed to the peasants between 1897 and 1905.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

TABLE IX. LEASING OF AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY IN THE OLD KINGDOM, 1907

Category of Property (hectares)	Amount Leased (hectares)	Percentage of Land Leased
50–100	40,184	24.09
100–500	409,608	50.17
500–1,000	467,819	58.28
1,000–3,000	721,198	58.33
3,000–5,000	318,628	73.36
Over 5,000	376,708	72.43
Total over 50 ha.	2,334,145	56.86

SOURCE: *Ibid.*, p. 140.

TABLE X. DISTRIBUTION OF LAND BY FARM UNITS IN THE OLD KINGDOM, 1918

Categories of Farms (hectares)	Number	Percentage of Total Number	Total Area Covered (hectares)	Percentage of Total Area	Average of the Category (hectares)
0–2	476,649	42.0	572,169	9.7	1.20
2–5	441,336	39.0	1,546,311	26.5	3.50
5–10	161,550	14.3	1,118,409	19.2	7.34
10–25	42,996	3.8	622,174	10.7	14.47
25–50	5,697	0.5	193,128	3.3	33.91
50–100	1,554	0.1	107,182	1.8	68.96
100–500	2,377	0.2	587,549	10.1	247.50
Over 500	1,043	0.1	1,093,699	18.7	1,047.10
	1,133,202	100.0	5,840,621	100.0	5.15

Categories of Farms	Owner-cultivated		Tenant-cultivated	
	Area (hectares)	*Per Cent*	*Area (hectares)*	*Per Cent*
0–2	421,712	73.7	150,457	26.3
2–5	1,045,525	67.6	500,786	32.4
5–10	647,518	57.9	470,891	42.1
10–25	396,764	63.8	225,410	36.2
25–50	141,263	73.1	51,865	26.9
50–100	74,408	69.4	32,774	30.6
100–500	281,871	48.0	305,678	52.0
Over 500	495,860	45.3	597,839	54.7
	3,504,921	60.0	2,335,700	40.0

SOURCE: Rumanian Ministry of Agriculture, *Agricultorii şi repartizarea pămîntului cultivat în 1913* (Bucarest, 1915), quoted in David Mitrany, *The Land and*

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

113 *the Peasant in Rumania* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930), pp. 241–242.

COMMENT: Unfortunately this table and Table VIII, on the distribution of properties, appear to defy comparison, and in certain important respects they are in serious contradiction. The total area for properties is some 2,000,000 hectares larger than that for farms. Probably a large part of this difference is attributable to grazing lands and fallow, which are not included in the statistics for farms. According to figures for 1905, pasture and fallow amounted to about 1,400,000 hectares. L. Colescu, *Progresele economice ale României indeplinite sub domnia M.S. Regelui Carol I, 1866–1906* (Bucarest, 1907), p. 51. Owner-cultivated farms under 100 hectares are given as some 1,300,000 hectares less than properties under 100 hectares (2,727,000 hectares as against 4,016,000 hectares). It seems impossible to explain this difference either by the absence of grazing land, which belonged mainly to large properties, or by mutual interleasing among peasants, which could scarcely have achieved such a magnitude. The figure for farms over 100 hectares is some 2,100,000 hectares less than that for properties over 100 hectares (1,681,000 hectares as against 3,810,000 hectares). This difference is to be explained by the absence of grazing land in the farm statistics, by the fact that land was leased from the large estates to peasant farms, and by the sale of estate land between 1907 and 1913, but the relative importance of these factors is not clear. The total area leased from properties over 100 hectares is given by Creangă at about 2,300,000 hectares; the total farm area under tenant cultivation, for both large and small farms, is about 2,336,000 hectares, but this similarity is misleading because the figure for leased properties presumably includes grazing land.

The only point in mentioning these inconsistencies—especially in statistics which are known to be of uncertain reliability—is that repeated attempts have been made to reach too definite conclusions through a collation of these tables or a selected part thereof.

● 31 TABLE XI. PRE-1914 DISTRIBUTION OF LAND IN BESSARABIA

A. By Type of Property

Categories		Number of Properties	Total Area (hectares)	Average Area (hectares)	Per Cent of Total Area
1. Private individual properties	Nobles	1,474	818,744	555.4	20.1
	Priests	126	4,308	34.2	0.1
	Merchants, etc.	1,944	253,867	—	6.7
	Peasants	7,718	135,384	17.5	8.2
	Foreigners	13	30,390	2,337.6	0.8
	Various	10,102	94,157	9.0	2.3
	Large owners	275	169,416	616.3	4.8
		21,652	1,506,266	69.4	36.8
2. Joint holdings		540	201,591	373.3	4.9
3. Nadyel lands		2,209	2,111,940	956.0	50.7
4. State domains		—	53,648	—	1.3
5. Churches and monasteries		—	204,190	—	5.0
6. Town properties		—	28,600	—	0.6
7. Private institutions		—	30,362	—	0.7
		24,401	4,131,597	166.3	100.0

SOURCE: E. Giurgea in *Buletinul Statistic*, No. 2 (1919), pp. 824–827, quoted in Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

311

B. By Size of Property

Properties (hectares)	Area	Per Cent of Total Area	Number of Proprietors	Per Cent of Total Number
0–10	2,156,827	51.6	285,663	98.4
10–100	180,984	4.3		
Over 100	1,844,539	44.1	4,480	1.6
	4,182,350	100.0	290,143	100.0

SOURCE: Alexander Nasta, "La Réforme agraire en Roumanie," report presented to the Fourteenth Congress of the International Congress of Agriculture (Bucarest, June 7–10, 1929).

COMMENT: These figures must be regarded as very approximate, since they involve, among other things, a translation of Russian returns which were based upon types of ownership rather than size. The number of proprietors in Table B, which is much greater than the number of properties in Table A, includes the peasants cultivating nadyel (allotted) land, which had been granted to the peasant commune rather than to the individual under the Russian emancipation.

TABLE XII. PRE-1914 DISTRIBUTION OF LAND IN BUCOVINA

A. Distribution of Total Area

Categories (hectares)	Number of Properties	Per Cent	Area (hectares)	Per Cent
0–10	191,737	96.27	270,780	25.92
10–100	6,606	3.32	134,115	12.84
100–500	585	0.29	130,939	12.53
Over 500	257	0.12	508,674	48.71
	199,185	100.00	1,044,458	100.00

SOURCE: Livius Lazar, *La Mise en oeuvre de la réforme agraire*, p. 64, quoted in Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

B. Distribution of Agricultural Land (Arable, Meadows, and Pasture, but Excluding Forests)

Categories (hectares)	Area (hectares)	Per Cent
0–10	264,678	48
10–100	152,094	27
Over 100	140,560	25
	557,327	100

SOURCE: Ifor L. Evans, *The Agrarian Revolution in Roumania* (Cambridge, 1924), p. 87, from information provided by Rumanian authorities in Bucovina.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

311

TABLE XIII. PREREFORM DISTRIBUTION OF LAND IN TRANSYLVANIA

Category (hectares)	Number of Owners	Per Cent	Area (hectares)	Per Cent
0–10	843,448	87.6	2,536,738	34
10–100	113,887	11.8	2,153,117	29
Over 100	4,601	0.6	2,751,457	37
	961,936	100.0	7,441,312	100

SOURCE: Nasta, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

COMMENT: The reliability of this official estimate is extremely doubtful. The table appears to be only an approximate conversion into hectares of figures compiled in cadastral yokes by the provisional Transylvanian government in 1919. The reliability of the latter compilation has been challenged. According to Hungarian critics "no exact figures are or ever have been available for the land distribution in 1919 in the total area annexed by Rumania." C. A. Macartney, *Hungary and Her Successors* (Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 316, n. 2.

311
423

TABLE XIV. LAND EXPROPRIATED UNDER THE AGRARIAN REFORMS OF 1918 AND 1921, AS OF 1927

	Old Kingdom (hectares)	Transylvania (hectares)	Bucovina (hectares)	Bessarabia (hectares)	Total (hectares)
Arable	2,269,192.27	470,389.56	48,544.64	1,210,627.20	3,998,753.67
Meadow	27,386.94	80,745.60	9,742.63	—	117,875.17
Pasture	442,988.68	898,257.50	8,296.69	—	849,542.87
Forests	19,156.10	663,967.24	8,420.54	198,404.60	889,948.48
Orchards, Vineyards	2,466.18	12,114.07	—	—	14,580.25
Building land, farmyards, etc.	360.11	14,006.35	357.16	—	14,723.62
Barren	14,851.15	24,328.71	605.69	82,888.44	122,673.99
Total	2,776,401.43	1,663,809.03	75,967.35	1,491,920.24	6,008,098.05

SOURCE: Nasta, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

COMMENT: Despite the confident calculation to two decimal places, the accuracy of this table is rather uncertain. In 1937 the figure given for the total amount of expropriated land was somewhat less: 5,811,827 hectares. G. Ionescu-Sişeşti and N. Cornăţeanu, *La Réforme agraire en Roumanie et ses conséquences* (Bucarest, 1937), p. 36. In 1940 it was officially announced that 8,900 estates were still in possession of land which was to have been expropriated. Moreover, there seems to have been a good deal of circumvention of the expropriation laws through the reconstitution of estates by a variety of semilegal or illegal means. According to Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 228, the Ministry of Agriculture confirmed that in the steppe region of the Bărăgan newly formed estates, running up to 8,000 hectares, could be found.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

TABLE XV. DISPOSITION OF LAND EXPROPRIATED UNDER AGRARIAN REFORMS OF 1918 AND 1921, AS OF 1927

	Old Kingdom (hectares)	Transylvania (hectares)	Bucovina (hectares)	Bessarabia (hectares)
Distributed to peasants	2,037,293.04	451,653.96	42,882.25	1,098,045.50
Communal pastures	524,720.87	418,861.43	5,881.85	—
Communal forests	—	484,805.24	4,377.72	—
Forests administered by state to be distributed	21,027.90	179,162.00	8,523.84	198,404.60
Land unfit for distribution	17,677.44	36,442.78	605.69	82,888.44
Reserved for general needs	175,682.18	93,383.62	13,796.00	112,581.70
Total expropriated	2,776,401.43	1,663,809.03	75,967.35	1,491,920.24

SOURCE: Nasta, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

COMMENT: The reliability of this table depends upon that of Table XIV.

TABLE XVI. LAND RECEIVED BY THE PEASANTS UNDER THE AGRARIAN REFORMS OF 1918 AND 1921

A. As of 1927

	Number of Peasants Entitled to Land	Number of Peasants Receiving Land	Area Distributed (hectares)	Area Distributed as Communal Pasture (hectares)	Area Distributed as Communal Forests (hectares)
Old Kingdom	1,053,628	630,118	2,037,293.04	524,720.87	—
Transylvania	490,528	310,583	451,653.96	418,861.43	484,805.24
Bucovina	77,911	71,266	42,882.25	5,881.85	4,377.72
Bessarabia	357,016	357,016	1,098,045.50	—	—
Total	1,979,083	1,368,978	3,629,824.75	948,914.15	489,182.96

SOURCE: *Ibid.*

B. As of 1938

	Number of Peasants with Right to Land	Number Receiving Land		Land Distributed (hectares)	Average Area per Peasant Receiving Land under Reform
		Number	*Per Cent of those with right*		
Old Kingdom	1,075,330	648,843	60.3	2,266,740	3.4
Transylvania	490,528	310,583	63.3	489,043	1.6
Bucovina	82,608	76,941	93.2	49,179	0.6
Bessarabia	357,016	357,016	100.0	1,098,045	3.1
Total	2,005,477	1,393,383	69.5	3,923,007	2.8

SOURCE: *60 Sate romdnești* (5 vols., Bucarest, 1941–43), II, 10.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

● 311
423

TABLE XVII. DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY FOLLOWING THE AGRARIAN REFORMS OF 1918 AND 1921, AS OF 1927

Before the Reform:

	Small Property (under 100 ha.)	Per Cent	Large Property (over 100 ha.)	Per Cent
Old Kingdom	4,593,148	57.5	3,397,851	42.5
Bessarabia	2,837,811	55.9	1,844,539	44.1
Transylvania	4,089,855	63.0	2,751,457	37.0
Bucovina	405,000	78.0	115,000	22.0
	12,025,814		8,108,847	

or:

Small Property: 12,025,814 ha. or 59.77%
Large Property: 8,108,847 ha. or 40.23%
20,134,661 ha.

After the Reform:

	Small Property	Per-Cent	Large Property	Per Cent
Old Kingdom	7,369,549	92.22	621,450	7.78
Bessarabia	3,829,781	91.57	352,619	8.43
Transylvania	6,353,664	85.38	1,087,648	14.62
Bucovina	480,967	92.49	39,033	7.51
	18,033,911		2,100,750	

or:

Small Property: 18,033,911 ha. or 89.56%
Large Property: 2,100,750 ha. or 10.44%
20,134,661 ha.

SOURCE: Nasta, *op. cit.*, pp. 26–27.

COMMENT: Although these figures have been used as the basis for most studies of Rumanian agriculture, they are misleading and incorrect. The area estimated as having been expropriated from properties over 100 hectares (Table XIV) was simply subtracted from estimates of the prereform extent of such property and added to the estimates of properties under 100 hectares. The results are naturally quite impressive but unacceptable. The prewar figures for the Old Kingdom were based upon G. D. Creangă's estimate for 1905 (Table VIII) (except that the figure for properties under 10 hectares was taken from the somewhat higher estimate of the Ministry of Finance for 1905, a justified substitution). An estimated reduction of properties over 100 hectares between 1905 and 1918 (amounting to 412,500 hectares) was added to the 1905 figure for those below 10 hectares. As a result of this method of computation, the total area of medium properties, between 10 and 100 hectares, is assumed not to have changed at all between 1905 and 1927. All the land expropriated is considered to have been transferred to the small peasants, when, in fact, of the 2,776,000 hectares reported expropriated in the Old Kingdom, only 2,087,000 hectares of arable had been distributed to the peasants by 1927, and 525,000 hectares of communal grazing land established.

It has already been noted that the accuracy of estimates of prereform land distribution in Transylvania was doubtful. Only properties of over 100 hectares are reported

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

to have suffered expropriation, although in Transylvania there were undoubtedly numerous cases where land under that figure was taken. In Bucovina, of the 75,967 hectares expropriated, some 28,000 were reported in 1927 to be either unfit for settlement or held as state-administered forest, and therefore cannot be regarded as having increased peasant holdings. In Bessarabia, all properties over 100 hectares were to have been expropriated; of the 1,845,000 hectares in this category, 1,492,000 were expropriated, and only 1,100,000 distributed to the peasants.

Finally, forest land is handled ambiguously. In Transylvania about 40 per cent (664,000 hectares) of the area expropriated from large estates was forest; in the Old Kingdom, however, the forests of large landowners—which were not expropriated but which in 1905 amounted to over 800,000 hectares in private ownership alone—were not included in the figures (this seems also to have been the case with the extensive forests of Bucovina). To have made the statistics consistent either all forest properties in all regions should have been included, which would have increased considerably the area shown as remaining to large properties after the reform, or they should have been omitted, which would have reduced the size of the area reported expropriated by nearly 900,000 hectares. In general, then, the conclusions were artificially established and certainly represent an inflated picture of the redistribution of property.

TABLE XVIII. FISCAL CENSUSES ON LANDHOLDINGS, 1923 AND 1928

Hectares	1923 Number of Taxpayers	1923 Area (hectares)	1923 Average Size (hectares)	1928 Number of Taxpayers	1928 Area (hectares)	1928 Average Size (hectares)
0–5	3,154,211	5,745,921	1.8	3,408,508	6,658,801	2.0
5–10	458,534	2,618,824	5.7	455,934	3,000,859	6.6
10–50	181,494	2,359,075	13.0	189,807	2,286,413	16.4
50–250	16,557	1,425,053	86.0	13,163	1,308,121	99.4
Over 250	3,168	1,537,046	485.1	1,834	861,299	469.4
Total	3,813,964	13,685,919	3.6	4,019,241	14,110,493	3.5

SOURCE: *60 Sate româneşti*, II, 12–15.

COMMENT: Although these tables, prepared by the Ministry of Finance for tax purposes and using different categories of size of landholding, cannot be compared with earlier or later figures, they are of use in showing certain trends in land distribution in the 1920's. The 1928 figure for properties over 250 hectares seems very low, however, since a Ministry of Finance estimate for 1927 (given in Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 247) listed 2,597 owners in this category with an area of 1,305,672 hectares.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

TABLE XIX. DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND ACCORDING TO SIZE OF EXPLOITATION, 1930 CENSUS

Categories of Exploitations (hectares)	Exploitations		Total Area		Cultivated Area	
	Number	*Per Cent*	*Hectares*	*Per Cent*	*Hectares*	*Per Cent*
0–1	610,000	18.6	320,000	1.6	275,000	2.1
1–3	1,100,000	33.5	2,200,000	11.1	1,850,000	14.4
3–5	750,000	22.9	3,015,000	15.3	2,475,000	19.3
0–5	2,460,000	75.0	5,535,000	28.0	4,600,000	35.8
5–10	560,000	17.1	3,955,000	20.0	3,110,000	24.2
10–20	180,000	5.5	2,360,000	12.0	1,715,000	13.3
20–50	55,000	1.7	1,535,000	7.8	1,015,000	7.9
50–100	12,800	0.4	895,000	4.5	540,000	4.2
100–500	9,500	0.3	2,095,000	10.6	920,000	7.2
Over 500	2,700	0.1	3,375,000	17.1	950,000	7.4
Total	3,280,000	100.0	19,750,000	100.0	12,850,000	100.0

SOURCE: Institutul Central de Statistică, *Statistica agricolă a Romăniei în 1938* (Bucarest, 1939), p. 94.

COMMENT: This table, the only general summary published for the 1930 census, presents certain difficulties. The figure for the total cultivated area corresponds with the 12,857,112 hectares of arable (cereals, artificial meadows, fallow, alimentary and industrial crops) reported under cultivation in 1930. It is less easy to determine what the 19,750,000 hectares include. Since in 1930 arable land plus grazing, orchards, and vineyards amounted to only 17,525,000 hectares, the figure must include some 2,000,000 of the 7,134,000 hectares of forest land. Some sources (e.g., *Bréviaire statistique de la Roumanie, 1940*) state that the 1930 figures refer to properties rather than exploitations.

TABLE XX. DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL PROPERTIES AND EXPLOITATIONS ACCORDING TO SIZE, 1941 CENSUS

Category of Size (hectares)	Properties		Exploitations		Extent of Properties		Extent of Exploitations	
	Number	*Per Cent*	*Number*	*Per Cent*	*Hectares*	*Per Cent*	*Hectares*	*Per Cent*
Total	2,257,050	100.0	2,263,963	100.0	10,419,000	100.0	10,419,570	100.0
Under 0.1			83,815	3.7				
0.1–0.5			172,709	7.6				
0.5–1.0			211,337	9.3				
Total under 1	524,549	23.3	467,861	20.6	230,000	2.2	190,883	1.8
1–3	792,969	35.1	757,646	33.5	1,559,000	15.0	1,446,627	13.9
3–5	415,921	18.4	439,919	19.5	1,680,000	16.1	1,704,211	16.4

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

Category of Size (hectares)	Properties		Exploitations		Extent of Properties		Extent of Exploitations	
	Number	*Per Cent*	*Number*	*Per Cent*	*Hectares*	*Per Cent*	*Hectares*	*Per Cent*
5–10	881,444	16.9	448,188	19.8	2,707,000	26.0	3,072,676	29.5
10–20	100,932	4.5	115,481	5.1	1,340,000	12.9	1,489,895	14.3
20–50	31,479	1.4	26,167	1.1	883,000	8.5	713,360	6.8
50–100	4,891	0.2	4,789	0.2	315,000	3.0	317,842	3.1
100–200	2,544	0.1	2,099	0.1	349,000	3.3		
200–500	1,690	0.1	1,286	0.1	521,000	5.0	1,484,076	14.2
Over 500	631	0.0	527	0.0	835,000	8.0		

SOURCE: Roman Cresin, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

COMMENT: This census, which did not cover Northern Transylvania, Bessarabia, Northern Bucovina, or Southern Dobrogea, was limited to land in private cultivation and did not include state, public, or communal holdings. It did, however, include forests and other nonagricultural land if these were in private hands.

The area covered by the census comprised a little over half the total area of Rumania:

Type of Terrain	Total Area (1,000 ha.)	Area Covered in Census (1,000 ha.)	Difference	
			In 1,000 hectares	*In per cent*
Arable	8,578	7,486	1,090	12.7
Meadow	1,069	831	238	22.3
Pasture	2,209	368	1,841	83.3
Vineyards	209	167	42	20.1
Orchards	195	145	50	25.6
Forest	4,789	803	3,986	83.2
Other land	2,476	387	2,089	84.4
Total	19,525	10,187	9,338	47.8

The difference of 9,338,000 hectares between the total area and the area covered by the census was accounted for as follows:

	Hectares
Individual exploitations omitted from the census but included subsequently, and in Table XX	232,000
Communal pastures	1,600,000
State forests	1,500,000
Forests belonging to various institutions	ca. 2,500,000
Lakes, ponds, etc. from the floodable regions of the Danube	ca. 900,000
Areas occupied by communications, cities, industries, etc.	ca. 1,000,000
State farms, land belonging to Ministry of Agriculture, crown domains, and undeclared areas	ca. 1,600,000
	9,332,000

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

311
464

TABLE XXI. DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPLOITATIONS ACCORDING TO USE OF LABOR, 1941

	Number	Per Cent	Per Cent	Area (hectares)	Per Cent	Per Cent	Average Size (hectares)
General total	2,258,530	100.0		10,187,003	100.0		4.51
Dwarf exploitations (a)	471,618	20.9		818,965	8.1		0.68
Exploitations remaining after leasing (b)	54,882	2.4		45,856	0.4		0.83
Exploitations proper (c)	1,732,030	76.7	100.0	9,822,182	96.5	100.0	5.67
Exploitations worked by hired labor only	25,466	—	1.5	1,188,015	—	12.1	46.65
Exploitations worked by family and hired labor	265,906	—	15.3	2,438,642	—	24.8	9.17
Exploitations worked by family labor only	1,009,031	—	58.3	4,667,089	—	47.5	4.63
Exploitations worked by only part of family labor	431,627	—	24.9	1,528,436	—	15.6	3.54

(a) Very small exploitations cultivated by peasants with little or no land; exploitations not the principal occupation of the cultivator.

(b) Land remaining after the proprietor has rented out more than 80 per cent of the total property, the remainder representing only limited agricultural activity—a few animals, a garden, etc.

(c) Exploitations of at least two hectares, or one hectare of arable, or 0.5 hectares of land devoted to vineyards, orchards, etc.

SOURCE: *Ibid.*, pp. 24–25.

TABLE XXII. DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPLOITATIONS ACCORDING TO USE OF LABOR AND TYPE OF TENURE, 1941

	Number	Per Cent of Total	Per Cent of Subgroup
Total exploitations proper	1,732,030	100.0	—
A. Worked by hired labor only	25,466	1.5	100.0
1. On own land	16,294	0.9	64.0
2. On own and rented land	4,716	0.3	18.5
3. On rented land only	4,456	0.3	17.5

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

311 464

	Number	Per Cent of Total	Per Cent of Subgroup
B. Worked by hired and family labor	265,906	15.3	100.0
1. On own land	192,674	11.1	72.5
2. On own and rented land	70,775	4.1	26.6
3. On rented land only	2,457	0.1	0.9
C. Worked by family labor only	1,009,031	58.3	100.0
1. On own land	720,013	41.6	71.4
2. On own and rented land (a)	289,018	16.7	28.6
D. Worked by part of family labor	431,627	24.9	100.0
1. On own land	315,167	18.2	73.0
2. On own and rented land (a)	116,460	6.7	27.0

(a) Peasant exploitations using family labor on rented land only were too infrequent to warrant inclusion as a separate category.

SOURCE: *Ibid.*, p. 28.

TABLE XXIII. PREVALENCE OF TYPES OF CULTIVATION (BY PERCENTAGE) ACCORDING TO SIZE OF EXPLOITATION IN THE JUDEŢ OF ARGEŞ, 1941

311

	Total	Categories of Size (hectares)									
		Under 0.1	*.1–.5*	*.5–1*	*1–3*	*3–5*	*5–10*	*10–20*	*20–50*	*50–100*	*Over 100*
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total exploitations proper	70.5	1.9	3.0	10.9	78.9	99.8	99.9	99.8	100.0	97.5	97.6
A. With hired labor only	1.3	—	—	0.1	0.3	0.9	2.2	7.3	23.4	53.7	97.6
B. With hired and family labor	11.7	0.1	0.1	0.6	6.8	14.9	25.9	50.6	65.9	43.8	—
C. With family labor only	30.9	0.2	1.0	3.9	34.6	47.4	47.0	27.2	8.1	—	—
D. With part of family labor	26.6	1.6	1.9	6.3	37.2	36.6	24.8	14.7	2.6	—	—
Remaining after leasing	1.2	23.4	5.0	1.3	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	—	2.5(a)	2.4(a)
Holdings of agricultural workers with little land	24.3	33.3	73.8	78.7	19.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Holdings of agricultural workers without land	0.5	15.5	2.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dwarf exploitations whose cultivator has nonagricultural occupation	3.5	25.9	15.8	9.1	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—

(a) The unexplained presence of exploitations of over 50 hectares in the category "Remaining after leasing" (i.e., remaining after 80 per cent of the property has been let out) presumably indicates a few large properties of little agricultural value, since according to the census this category was unimportant agriculturally.

SOURCE: Roman Cresin, *Agricultura din judeţul Argeş* (Bucarest, 1945), p. 11.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

● 31
423

TABLE XXIV. EXPROPRIATION AND REDISTRIBUTION OF LAND UNDER 1945 AGRARIAN REFORM, AS OF JANUARY 8, 1947

Regions	Number of Proprietors Expropriated	Area Expropriated (hectares)	Area Distributed (hectares)	Area Reserved by the State (hectares)	Peasants	
					Having right to land	*Having received land*
RUMANIA	143,219	1,443,911	1,057,674	387,565	1,114,888	796,129
Plains of Siret and Prut	1,542	196,130	162,486	33,644	196,608	160,334
Moldavian Carpathians	349	47,529	32,615	14,914	87,542	50,171
Muntenian and Oltenian Carpathians	1,802	115,065	71,214	51,851	178,618	99,088
Danube Plain	2,787	309,886	241,218	68,673	248,720	220,181
Dobrogea	1,122	62,333	52,089	3,562	34,795	18,165
Bucovina	79	4,510	4,412	198	17,707	8,518
Transylvanian Plateau	62,157	345,598	215,956	129,642	206,054	123,938
Tisa Plain	73,381	362,760	277,689	85,071	142,849	115,737

SOURCE: Institutul Central de Statistică, *Comunicări statistice*, No. 17 (March 15, 1947), p. 9.

TABLE XXV. DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL PROPRIETORSHIP AND EXPLOITATIONS AFTER 1945 AGRARIAN REFORM, AS OF JANUARY, 25, 1948

Categories of Size (hectares)	Proprietors		Exploitations	
	Number	*Per Cent*	*Number*	*Per Cent*
0–0.5	901,016	16.4	233,153	7.5
0.5–1	1,100,852	20.0	296,821	9.6
1–2	1,472,785	26.8	1,106,754	35.7
2–3	838,286	15.2		
3–5	697,318	12.7	707,001	22.8
5–10	363,678	6.6	551,090	17.8
10–20	88,335	1.6	153,516	5.0
20–50	23,698	0.4	34,222	1.1
Over 50	15,170	0.3	14,120	0.5
Total	5,501,138	100.0	3,096,177	100.0

SOURCE: A. Golopenţia and P. Onica, *Recensământul agricol din Republica Populară Română, 25 ianuarie 1948, rezultate provizorii* (Bucarest, 1948), pp. 11–16.

COMMENT: The value of this census is greatly reduced by the failure to publish the amount of land comprised in the various categories of properties and exploitations. Of a total area of 23,730,000 hectares, 20,661,000 were declared as properties and 19,199,000 hectares as exploitations (of which 94 per cent were declared as owned by the cultivator). The fact that there were 1.8 proprietors to each exploitation (5,501,000 proprietors and 3,096,000 exploitations) is explained, presumably, by the numerous cases of joint proprietorship: husband and wife, parents and children, etc.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

TABLE XXVI. COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION OF EXPLOITATIONS BY SIZE IN 1941 AND 1948 (EXCLUDING NORTHERN TRANSYLVANIA)

Categories of Size (hectares)	1941		1948	
	Number	*Per Cent*	*Number*	*Per Cent*
0–0.5	277,500	12.0	190,169	7.3
0.5–1	218,068	9.3	246,016	9.5
1–3	760,700	33.0	933,333	35.9
3–5	441,213	19.2	604,540	23.3
5–10	449,716	19.5	462,607	17.8
10–20	116,537	5.1	122,262	4.7
20–50	27,845	1.2	26,607	1.0
Over 50	16,873	0.7	11,316	0.4
Total	2,308,472	100.0	2,596,900	100.0

SOURCE: *Ibid.*, p. 20.

COMMENT: Although the geographic regions covered in these two tables are the same, the comparison sheds little light and may be misleading, because the amount of land included in each category is not given. In 1941, according to the census of that year, the 2,300,000 exploitations occupied only 10,419,000 hectares, of which about three-fourths was arable. According to the 1948 census the 2,600,000 exploitations occupied approximately 17,000,000 hectares, of which less than one-half was arable. Because of this great difference in the amount of land involved, it would be fallacious to use these tables as a demonstration of the effects of the 1945 agrarian reform.

TABLE XXVII. PRINCIPAL BRANCHES OF AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY

A. Percentage of Arable Devoted to Different Crops

	Cereals	Wheat	Maize	Barley	Oats	Rye	Alimentary Plants	Industrial Plants	Forage Crops	Fallow
1921–25	87.1	25.5	31.7	15.6	11.3	2.5	3.3	2.2	4.2	3.2
1926–30	85.4	24.4	34.7	14.4	8.8	2.5	3.3	3.1	5.1	3.1
1931–35	83.9	24.0	36.8	13.4	6.2	2.9	3.6	2.8	5.5	4.2
1936	83.3	24.6	37.7	11.6	5.8	3.0	3.8	3.5	5.6	3.8
1937	82.4	25.7	36.5	10.8	5.6	3.3	3.7	3.6	5.2	5.1
1938	82.1	28.3	36.3	9.0	4.7	3.4	3.6	3.5	5.3	5.5

SOURCE: *Statistica agricolă a Romîniei în 1938*, pp. xiv–xv.

B. Distribution of Agricultural Exploitations According to Type of Farming

	Percentage of Total Number of Exploitations	
	1941	*1948*
Cereals	80.7	60.7
Animal husbandry	12.5	1.2
Viticulture	1.4	1.3
Fruits	0.7	0.7
Mixed, and other	34.7	36.1

SOURCES: *Recensămîntul agricol din 1941; Recensămîntul agricol din Republica Populară Romînă.*

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

241
311

TABLE XXVIII. PERCENTAGE OF LAND DEVOTED TO DIFFERENT CROPS ACCORDING TO SIZE OF PROPERTY, 1938

	Size of Property (hectares)						
	0.1–1	*1–3*	*3–5*	*5–10*	*10–25*	*Over 25*	*Total*
Cereals	51.37	62.61	64.61	72.94	78.14	50.42	66.05
Alimentary plants	4.21	3.59	3.17	2.27	2.75	2.40	2.75
Intercropped plants	2.64	2.36	1.86	1.14	0.86	0.90	1.35
Forage crops	4.27	6.63	7.58	5.00	3.97	3.06	5.03
Industrial plants	1.12	1.77	2.46	1.84	1.29	1.44	1.73
Fallow	0.90	1.77	2.33	2.46	1.90	0.71	1.90
Natural meadow	10.53	7.90	5.86	3.42	3.12	7.62	5.11
Pasture	0.25	1.09	1.67	1.87	1.70	2.22	1.78
Orchards	5.50	1.75	1.19	0.77	0.76	0.53	1.00
Vineyards	10.29	4.61	3.91	3.43	2.99	0.79	3.22
Forests	5.60	3.83	3.61	2.67	3.95	25.43	7.18
Barren	0.15	0.59	0.23	0.38	0.49	0.52	0.42
Not utilized	3.16	1.56	2.02	1.83	3.07	3.96	2.47

SOURCE: *60 Sate romînești*, II, 97.

COMMENT: These figures were reached through a sampling investigation of some 60 villages.

243

TABLE XXIX. PRODUCTION OF PRINCIPAL GRAINS

	Output in 1,000 Quintals				Area Covered
	Wheat	*Maize*	*Barley*	*Oats*	
1921–25	24,377	35,513	12,063	9,118	71 *judeje*, frontiers as of January, 1938
1925–30	30,138	46,071	19,139	11,047	
1931–35	26,285	53,672	13,122	6,553	
1936	35,031	56,120	16,119	8,471	
1937	38,096	46,560	9,463	5,158	
1938	49,124	52,281	8,232	4,605	
1935–39	25,960	39,020	5,500	4,010	40 *judeje*, frontiers as of January, 1941
1940	13,758	37,432	4,963	3,707	
1941	19,862	38,472	3,911	3,330	
1942	8,549	21,816	3,823	3,372	
1943	23,287	22,283	5,165	4,526	
1944	26,529	32,549	3,821	3,502	
1945	10,885	13,138	2,441	2,334	
1945	12,745	18,196	3,376	3,567	58 *judeje*, postwar frontiers
1946	16,087	10,040	2,334	2,823	

SOURCES: *Statistica agricolă a Romîniei în 1938*, p. xvii; *Statistica agricolă a Romîniei în 1941–1944*, p. xiii; *Expunere de motive la bugetul general al statului* (Bucarest, 1946, 1947).

233 TRANSHUMANCE has long played a prominent part in the
221 pastoral life of the Carpathians, for agriculturally the region is marginal and it is not very unusual for the maize crop, which covers an astonishingly large proportion of the arable land, to fail to mature. Before the late war the flocks of the eastern Carpathians used to winter in the plains of Moldavia, Bessarabia, the Dobrogea and south Russia, more rarely in Transylvania. During the nineteenth century, however, many Roumanian shepherds stayed in the plain and formed the nuclei of small permanent Roumanian colonies outside the boundaries of Transylvania.

423 DURING the last few centuries there have been considerable
311 changes in schemes of land holding. In the late eighteenth century the scattered possessions of the landlord class were consolidated into Latifundia. In the first half of the nineteenth century arable farming was extended into the Danubian plain and on the rich lands between Siret and Prut—in areas, that is to say, which had not been previously cultivated. This development progressed with the rise of an export trade in cereals to feed the industrial populations of the west. It is interesting to note that much of this newly-developed territory in Wallachia was organised on the system of métayage, the new colonists from the hills becoming tenants on a produce-sharing basis.

IN CONNECTION with this development, many of the Roumanian transhumant herdsmen gave up their pastoral life and settled as agriculturists or went into commerce. After 1918 the large estates were broken up and plots of land were given to the peasantry. This was the occasion for the return to Transylvania of some of the former emigrants who had gone to Wallachia and Moldavia, but naturally many features of the old life have disappeared, e.g. the July fairs that were formerly held high up in the mountains and did much to preserve the cultural heritage of the pastoral people.

[221] BUT, if large-scale seasonal migrations over long distances have declined, the short distance movements still play a vital part in the rural economy of the eastern Carpathians and fortunately have not as yet been divested of all their old-time ritual.

4:Fleure S-5 (no date)1936 EDl Rumania EDl

VI.—ECONOMIC ROUMANIA

AGRICULTURE.

311 MODERN ROUMANIA is essentially an agricultural state, as
162 was the Old Kingdom (43 to 46 per cent of the land being arable and 22 per cent forest, whilst over 80 per cent of the population of 18 millions are agricultural workers), although it has valuable potentialities for the development of industry.

132 ARRANGED in zones round the bastion of the southern and
241 eastern Carpathian highlands, the main agricultural regions
134 of post-war Roumania exhibit, according to aspect and altitude, a considerable variety of climatic conditions, which is reflected in a varying emphasis in the selection of crops raised. In general, we may say that the continental nature of the climate and the resulting succession from north to south and from highland to lowland of soils, graded from poor ashen-grey podsol in the Carpathians through oak-forest loams to a rich chernoziom in the south-eastern Danube plains, has resulted, wherever the ground is sufficiently level, in a concentration on grain production. The heavier rainfall of the uplands, the relatively great humidity and shelter from the driving winds that sweep across the open plains, coupled with the exposure of less
[137] fertile rocks—granites and coarse sandstones—explains the large area of forested land (24.5 per cent, nearly 7¼ million hectares) in those districts that extend into the Carpathian highlands.

243 OF THE 13 odd million hectares of arable land, cereals occupy some 37 to 39 per cent. Production varies greatly from year to year and from district to district. In the old kingdom of Wallachia-Moldavia, maize is by far the heaviest crop, particularly in Oltenia, where the summer rainfall is heavier. It is also the heaviest crop in Transylvania, the cultivated areas under maize, wheat, barley and oats being
[262] respectively 4, 3, 2 and 1 million hectares. Maize is the staple crop of the peasant holder almost throughout the country, for it not only provides the bread cakes and the "mamaliga," maize pudding, the main food of the mass of the people, but also fodder for the cattle to eke out the hay in

342 absence of small fields, although a vegetable garden is a
563 normal feature. Most of them are grouped together in a small colony on a piece of steeply-sloping ground near the western end of the village that could not be used for agricultural purposes, thus emphasising the fact that they constitute an exotic element living on the outskirts of the community (see Plate XII and Fig. 11).

311 THERE is no emigration from Corbu, but the tendency is to extend cultivation by forest-cutting. A good deal of land in the Bistricioara valley is still available.

II. FARMING ACTIVITIES

THE LAND AND INHERITANCE.

428 FARMING in Corbu is carried on essentially for subsistence
241 rather than for profit. Large-scale cultivation with its attendant economies would in any case be difficult in such an environment, but it is rendered impossible by a land tenure system, intimately bound up with laws of inheritance, which permits the subdivision of land from generation to generation. On the death of the father the widow receives a quarter of the estate, the remainder being divided equally amongst all the children. Alternatively, the latter take over their portion on marriage, but the result in each case is the same—the peasant holdings not only decrease in size but portions of the same holding may be widely separated. For it does not even follow that all the land surrounding a farmstead necessarily belongs to the family residing there. It did, of course, when the holding was first formed, but marriage has in most cases added complications. A portion of the holding, for example, may belong to a married daughter living elsewhere in the village and her husband will then come periodically to cultivate it as part of his estate. Much time is wasted in this way, so wherever possible an interchange of plots is arranged, especially where the parties to the marriage belong to different villages.

423 IN a register covering about 207 hectares of privately owned land there were 133 parcels registered, sometimes more than one in the name of a particular person. Of the 133, 56 were less than one hectare each, but at least 8 of these parcels were accessories to other holdings and those owners

423 dealt with a considerably larger area. Forty-six holdings were between one and two, 18 between two and three, 8 between three and four, 3 between four and five, and 2 larger (8.8 and 19.5) hectares in extent. These holdings do not necessarily represent the whole of the land owned by a peasant.

LAND UTILISATION.

311 BROADLY SPEAKING, the land within the commune may be divided into three categories: the alluvium of the Bistricioara valley and the lower portions of its tributary valleys which is devoted to arable farming; the deforested lower slopes of the valley sides, together with the broad upper portions of some of the tributary valleys and odd patches of level ground here and there which are reserved for hay; and the rest, which is forest with the exception of the small high-altitude clearings that provide summer pasturage for the transhumant flocks and herds.

311 ABOUT 58 per cent of the land belongs to the state, 37 per
423 cent to the commune, and the rest, comprising about 400 hectares, is owned by the peasants. These 400 hectares represent the arable land of the commune, whilst the state lands are entirely forest. The commune lands include a certain amount of forest, together with the hay meadows and summer pastures. The law tries to make peasants plant trees to replace those that they cut down.

CROPS.

241 IN the arable area the outstanding crop is maize, from which
[262] "mamaliga," the staple food of the peasants, is made. It is sown at the beginning of May, two hillings, separated by an interval of three or four weeks, are made during June, and the crop is harvested between September 25th and October 10th. Potatoes, hemp, flax, lucerne (of which three cuttings are usually made), a little rye, sunflowers and vegetables are grown, mostly in very small patches, giving the impression of garden, rather than field, cultivation. Occasionally a small orchard adds further variety to the general pattern.

246 THE HAY CROP is of vital importance, as in all mountain communities of this kind throughout Europe. It is harvested

133 cally, of the Bulgarian plateau that projects northward to
635 the Danube delta. The northern part is covered by hills, gradually sloping southwards towards the vast wooded but waterless stretches of the Dely-Orman, part of which still lies in Bulgaria.

The Banat and the Crishana form parts of the Hungarian plain and possess the same climatic and agricultural features as the latter. The eastern part of the Banat is mountainous, forming geologically an extension of Transylvania and of the western spurs of the southern Carpathians, while the Crishana is separated from Transylvania on the east by the mountainous mass of the Bihor mountains, reaching to an altitude of 1,800 meters.

Transylvania forms a circular tableland whose mean altitude is from 350 to 600 meters, and forms the essential nucleus of Rumania, both geographically and ethnically. It is encircled to the north, east, and south by the Carpathians, which occasionally reach to an altitude of 2,000 meters in the
[132] north and 2,544 meters in the southern section. Owing to an average annual rainfall of about 35 inches, numerous streams take their rise and drain the region, breaching the mountain rim and thus forming the main ways of egress. The Somesh, Muresh, and Timish, the former two affluents of the Theiss, the latter of the Danube, connect Transylvania with the Hungarian plain and with the Banat, while to the south the river Olt flows through the Red Tower pass to join the Danube and offers the main and easiest way of access into Rumania. The whole region consists of an undulating upland cut up by ranges of hills into valleys, some of which are fairly extensive and fertile, owing to the frequency of
• [31] alluvial deposits. The mountains are thickly wooded, about a third of the total area (32.19%) being under forest, and give rise to numerous streams, the presence of which explains the abundance of pasture land and meadows and accounts for the thriving live-stock rearing industry which forms the main source of the wealth of the province. The highlands of the Maramureş, to the north, form part of Transylvania, and are separated from it by the river Somesh.

Bucovina forms a geographic unit with Moldavia and used to form part of that principality prior to its occupation by the

GEOGRAPHIC AND ETHNOGRAPHIC NOTES

Austrians in 1775. Bucovina, in spite of its exiguousness in arable land—about one fourth of its surface being devoted to a variety of agricultural crops and orchards—is one of the most advanced agricultural regions of Rumania, maintaining in certain parts of the valleys of the Pruth and Sereth as dense a population as 300 inhabitants per square kilometre. Its forests are better preserved than those of the other provinces of the kingdom, thanks to the careful sylvan administration the Austrians had initiated. They cover 43% of the region and form the main source from which timber is obtained in Rumania, the river Sereth being used largely for floating down the logs to the Danubian port of Galatz, whence they are exported. When the Austrians annexed Bucovina in 1775 its population was only 72,000. Thanks to their excellent administration and their efforts to develop the country, its population had surpassed 800,000 when it was reunited to Rumania; the increase was due partly, however, to the Austrian attempt at denationalizing the country by settling Ruthenian immigrants. Cernauţi, better known as Czernowitz, is a modern town, beautifully planned and with all the amenities of a western city. The spirit of its inhabitants is distinctly occidental and reminds one of the mentality of Vienna, the more so, since they have distinct leanings towards Socialism owing to the preponderance of German culture. The town used to be an important centre of traffic between Galicia and Russia, but owing to the loss of its hinterland it seems as though struck with a sudden blight while in full prosperity. It has a population of 111,147, and constitutes the third largest town of Rumania.

Table showing population and area of provinces according to census of 1930.

	Population.	Area (sq. km.)
Wallachia	5,542,467	76,583.
Moldavia	2,413,123	38,058.
Bessarabia	2,865,506	44,422.
Bucovina	845,903	10,442.
Dobrudja	811,332	23,262.
Transylvania	3,217,149	
Maramureş and Crishana	1,387,675	102,200.
Banat	942,072	
Total population	18,025,237	Area .. 294,967.

neglecting the peasants; on the contrary, they saw in them a numerous and profitable crowd of clients for the banks, the majority of which were under their control. The less pecuniary aid the peasant obtained from the State, the greater would be his need of the private bank or usurer. And so well did the latter entangle the peasants in their tentacles that within ten years of the enactment of the Land Distribuion Act the debts contracted by the peasants had surpassed the value of their lands. Thus the much-belauded agrarian revolution in Rumania was threatened with complete failure, and so another revolutionary measure had to be passed, the strangely-termed "law for the sanitation of agrarian debts," in order to save the peasantry from being dispossessed of their land.

The *Argus* of 13th February, 1932, published the following table which shows how the land was actually distributed:

Area of properties.	Total hectares.	Percentage of area.	Number of proprietors.	Percentage of total Owners.	Average area of farm for each category.
Up to 5 hectares ...	6,280,993	43.60	3,731,403	84.20	1.94
5 to 10 hectares ...	2,919,863	20.20	435,715	11.30	6.70
10 to 50 hectares ...	2,392,689	16.60	148,860	3.90	16.07
50 to 250 hectares ...	1,505,257	10.40	18,122	0.50	83.06
Over 250 hectares ...	1,305,670	9.10	2,597	0.10	502.00
Total ...	14,404,462,	100.00	3,836,757	100.00	3.75

As one hectare sown to wheat yields approximately 1,200 kg. of wheat, and the average price of wheat during 1931 was about 2.25 lei, the revenue per hectare may be reckoned at abouf 2,700 lei. As the average holding of 84 per cent of the peasantry is about 2 hectares, the paper assumed that the revenue of each peasant household amounted approximately to some 5,400 lei, or about 160 gold francs. For the year 1931 the total revenue from agriculture was computed at 46,500 million lei, of which 21 milliards were derived from the cattle-rearing industry, 21 milliards from cereals, and 4½ milliards from other plants. Other crops were even less profitable; thus the average price of maize was 1.50 lei per kg. and the yield 1,500 kg. per hectare, so that the revenue per hectare amounted to 2,250 lei, and the figures for barley were respectively 2 lei, 1,400 kg., and 2,800 lei.

	Average for 5 years 1922—1926		1927		1928		1929		1930		1931	
	Area sown in 1,000 hectares.	Output in 1,000 quintals.	Area sown in 1,000 hectares.	Output in 1,000 quintals.	Area sown in 1,000 hectares.	Output in 1,000 quintals.	Area sown in 1,000 hectares.	Output in 1,000 quintals.	Area sown in 1,000 hectares.	Output in 1,000 quintals.	Area sown in 1,000 hectares.	Output in 1,000 quintals.
Wheat	2,806	24,250	3,118	26,320	2,814	31,440	2,664	28,000	3,055	36,000	3,466	36,800
Rye	287	2,280	277	2,470	319	2,910	310	3,400	391	4,500	407	3,600
Oats	1,197	9,530	1,185	8,420	1,304	9,800	1,200	13,600	1,087	11,600	871	6,700
Barley	1,668	13,180	1,749	13,310	2,190	15,110	2,000	30,400	1,975	23,700	1,919	14,100
Maize	3,593	40,790	3,847	35,330	4,626	27,530	4,790	60,800	4,426	45,200	4,754	63,600
Total	9,551	90,003	10,176	85,850	11,253	86,790	10,944	136,200	10,934	121,100	11,417	124,800

AVERAGE CROP YIELDS IN QUINTALS PER HECTARE

	Average for 1911/15	Average for 1921/26	Average for 1926/30	1929	1930	1931
Wheat ...	11.9	8.7	9.8	9.9	11.6	10.6
Rye ...	9.0	7.9	10.1	10.8	11.9	8.7
Oats ...	9.2	7.7	10.1	11.2	10.6	7.7
Barley ...	10.5	7.6	10.4	13.3	12.0	7.4
Maize ...	13.6	10.7	10.6	13.3	10.2	13.7

The above figures show that there is a vast scope for an improvement, for in Central European countries the average yield of wheat per hectare is about 20 quintals and in Denmark and Great Britain higher yields are common with a much poorer soil than that of Rumania.

241
3/1
4123

RUMANIA

241 The following table indicates the proportions of lands de-
311 voted to the various cultures and the distribution among the
● different provinces, according to official statistics for the year 1930:

Arable land in:	Area in hectares.	Percentage of total.
Old Kingdom	6,515,995	22.09
Bessarabia	2,915,941	9.88
Bucovina	311,616	1.[illegible]
Transylvania	3,113,500	10.55
Total of arable lands ...	12,857,112	43.58
Meadows and pastures ...	4,054,475	13.75
Orchards and Vineyards ...	613,614	2.08
Forests	7,134,200	24.18
Unproductive lands, roads, sites of buildings, rivers, mines, etc.	4,837,399	16.41
Total Area	29,496,700	100.00

From the above it will be seen that there is little scope for bringing more land under cultivation, and that an expansion in the output must be sought by improving the method of cultivation. Of course there is a vast expanse of marshes along the Danube which may be reclaimed—the total area of these is computed at two million hectares—and if they were turned to account they would considerably augment the arable area. It may be added that similar works of reclamation have been undertaken in Bulgaria and Greece and have been reported to be remunerative.

241 Besides cereals, industrial plants such as hemp, colza,
249 sun-flower, tobacco, sugar-beet are grown, some 399,506 hectares being sown with them. The sugar-beet industry is sufficiently developed to provide for the total requirements of the country and to allow even for an export surplus. There are 14 sugar refineries, with invested capital of 3,300 million lei and occupying some 15,000 workmen. It was reported in the *Argus* of February 20th, 1932, which took up the defence of the industry and emphasized the necessity of granting it adequate protection (since it prevented some 700 million lei from being annually remitted abroad), that the State
651 obtained a revenue of 13.70 lei per kg., or 42 per cent of the official price at which sugar was sold; that agriculturalists obtained 20 per cent, merchants 5 per cent, manufacturing and packing accounted for the remaining 33 per cent. But when expenses were deducted the net profit available to the

12: Kormos S-4, 5 (no date) 1944
ED1 Rumania ED1

[Oltenia]

Kingdom is Wallachia, which is formed by Oltenia and Muntenia.

OLTENIA. Oltenia is the western part of the principality of Wallachia. Its boundaries are, in the west and north the Carpathians, in the east the River Olt, and in the south the Danube. The province covers an area of about 9,640 square miles and has a population of about 1,900,000. The soil of the sub-Carpathian hills consists of sand and clay and gravel and is well watered by numerous rivulets. Here are some densely populated valleys, bordered by rich forests and grazing grounds. Farther south and extending to the Danube lies the fertile plain composed of the rich 'yellow earth'. Its character is similar to that of the lowlands of Muntenia, but it lies on a higher level and also has a higher rainfall.

The richest district of this fertile province is the *judet*[1] of Dolj in the south-western corner of Oltenia. From here, and the similarly fertile *judets* of Mehedinti and Romanati, also on the northern bank of the Danube, high-quality maize and wheat have been exported for many years. From the hilly country farther north fruit is the chief export. In the mountainous districts forestry provides the main occupation for the local inhabitants. There is much sheep-breeding, for the grassy slopes provide good grazing.

Apart from the Danube the two most important rivers of Oltenia are the Jiu and the Olt; the latter rises in Transylvania and enters Oltenia through the Red Tower Pass. Oltenia is not rich in mineral resources. There is, however, oil at Govora, west of

[1] Administrative unit.

12: Kormos S-4, 5 (no date) 1944
ED1 Rumania ED1

[Oltenia]
[Muntenia]

The Danubian ports of Calafat and Corabia handle wheat exports and also have some valuable industries.

MUNTENIA. To the east of the River Olt extends Muntenia, the other province of Wallachia. It covers an area of about 20,600 square miles and has a population of about 4,500,000. The southern and eastern boundaries of the province are formed by the Danube, the northern frontier by the Carpathians. The land surface and climate of Muntenia are similar to those of Oltenia, but the hilly region south of the Carpathians is narrower. The fertile steppes, Baragan, Burnas, Gavan and Burdeas, are situated on the northern banks of the Danube which floods the adjoining districts and forms many lakes and marshes. The highest peaks of the Carpathians in Muntenia are the Negoi and the Moldovan, both over 7,500 ft. The most important of the many rivers descending from the high mountains are the Dambovita, Jalomita, Arges and Buzau, all of which eventually flow into the Danube. The endless maize and wheat fields of Muntenia are covered in summer with heavy crops and on the steppes great flocks of sheep find their food. In spite of very dry summers and icy winters like those of Russia this region is one of the richest of Rumania and the whole of Europe.

Muntenia differs from all Rumanian provinces in that, in addition to stock breeding, the raising of high-quality crops, fishery and forestry, it possesses a source of wealth which is not found in such abundance in any other part of Europe, the oil fields of Campina and Ploesti. There the hilly, wooded countryside suddenly changes into a modern in-

[The Dobrudja]

part of the Dobrudja. The delta of the Danube is formed by the three arms Chilia, Sulina and St George. It includes an area of about 1,000 square miles, in which water and land, marshes, lakes and islands feed an almost tropical vegetation. The chief communications through the delta are provided by the Sulina canal and by causeways.

The steppes of the Southern Dobrudja yield good crops of wheat and maize, and the pastures maintain great herds of sheep. Mineral resources are confined to some unworked coal deposits, valuable copper near Altantepe, and sulphur.

The Dobrudja is about 9,300 square miles in all: of this some 2,960 square miles were returned to Bulgaria in 1940. The population of the province as a whole is about 850,000. Its main value to the contesting States lies in the Black Sea stretch of coast. The port of Constanza, the greatest and most important on the western shores of the Black Sea, has modern harbour works built at the beginning of this century and covering an area of 60 hectares. It was through Constanza that Rumanian exports used to pass to France and Great Britain. The docks of Constanza are about 30 ft. deep and can, therefore, be used by large, sea-going ships. The harbour facilities include storage buildings for wheat and oil-tanks with a capacity for over 200,000 cubic metres of fuel, which are fed by the pipe-lines coming from Ploesti. Oil can moreover be pumped straight from the pipe-lines simultaneously into four tankers. Another great advantage is that the port is completely ice-free all the winter. Constanza is the administrative centre of the Dobrudja and also a well-known seaside resort. Rail communications

1

7

12: Kormos S-4, 5 (no date) 1944

ED1 Rumania ED1

[Moldavia]

133 and good pasture. The Sereth, which waters this region and runs parallel to the Pruth, flows into the Danube below Galati.

135 On the eastern slopes of the Carpathians there are large deposits of oil which have not yet been fully exploited. In the *comitat* Bacau, also in the mountain region of Moldavia, there are some valuable coal and salt mines. The salt mines of Targu-Ocna are the most important in the whole of Rumania.

•311 The majority of the people of Moldavia are 438 employed on the land. They grow wheat, maize and sugar-beet and tend the vines. Recently, successful experiments have been made with the growing of industrial crops. Timber felling provides another source of income, especially at Targu-Neamt, Piatra-Neamt and Focsani. There are important refineries at Moinesti and Solont, sugar factories at Roman and Ripiceni, and large textile works at Buhusi.

361 The capital and economic centre of Moldavia is the town of Jasi, on the western bank of the Pruth. Its population numbers about 80,000, more than half of them Jews. Jasi, lying on a number of vine-growing hills overlooking the valley of the Pruth, is an old commercial centre, which used to be visited in the middle ages by Genoese, Venetian and Greek [368] merchants. In Jasi, with its wide streets flanked by long rows of one-storied houses, there is the oldest Rumanian University, founded by John Cuza, a famous library containing over 160,000 books, and many other cultural institutions. Jasi has a number of iron and steel works, several clothing factories and is the chief marketing centre for cattle and wine in Moldavia.

1

12: Kormos S-4, 5 (no date) 1944

EDI Rumania EDI

[The Crisana]

in the west and Czechoslovakia in the north. The inhabitants of the Crisana are Rumanians, Hungarians, Jews, Germans and some Slavs. Taken as a whole the province contains a slight Rumanian majority, but there is in the immediate frontier region a fairly homogeneous Hungarian population, which forms a local majority.

The western part of the Crisana has the same features as the lowlands of Hungary. The types of agriculture also closely resemble those of the rest of the country on both banks of the Tisza[H] (Theiss[G]). There are wide, flat fields of maize and wheat interspersed with pastures, grazed by horses and long-horn cattle. To the east the country rises and forms a chain of hills which produce good fruit and wine. Beyond are the mountains of Bihor (Bihar[H]) which form the western wall of Transylvania. These mountains are rich in coal, gold, copper, bauxite, asphalt and marble. Consequently this region maintains numerous industrial enterprises. Apart from its mineral resources and good wheat and maize the Crisana is also well known for its horses, cattle, pigs and sheep.

The capital of the Crisana is Oradea-Mare (Nagyvarad[H], Grosswardein[G]) in the valley of the Cris (Körös[H], Kreisch[G]). Its population of about 95,000 consists of Hungarians, Rumanians, Jews, Germans and others. Oradea is the junction for five railway lines and commands all the main communications leading from the Hungarian plain to Transylvania. The town is also the seat of many industries and the chief market for the agricultural produce of the province. Arad, on the northern bank of the Mures (Maros[H]), is inhabited by 65,000 people,

12: Kormos S-4, 5 (no date) 1944
ED1 Rumania ED1

[Transylvania]

Scaune (Haromszek[H]) which also possesses numerous industrial enterprises. Most of the rivers of Transylvania rise in the Eastern Carpathians and flow to the west and south. The Mures, flowing from east to west winds its way between the Carpathians and the 'Western Mountains' near Alba Julia (Gyulafehervar[H], Karlsburg[G]) and descends into the lowlands farther west. The Somes (Szamos[H]) reaches the plains north-west of the Transylvanian highland and eventually flows into the Tisza. Communications with Muntenia and Oltenia go over the mountain passes of Predeal, Bran and the 'Red Tower', with Moldavia over those of Buzau, Ghimes and Bicaz, and with the Bukovina over the Rodna Pass.

The climate of Transylvania is not as favourable for the raising of crops as that of Muntenia and the Banat. In the valleys, however, maize, wheat and rye are grown with some success. Stock-breeding is more important than agriculture. But Transylvania is very rich in mineral resources. Apart from coal, gold, copper, salt, bauxite and iron Transylvania possesses the greatest reserves of natural gas in the whole of Europe. The chemically pure methane which is used by many factories for power, as well as for cooking and lighting by many householders, could supply the whole of Transylvania for over a hundred years and make the consumption of coal unnecessary.

The capital of Transylvania is Cluj (Kolozsvar[H], Klausenburg[G]), with a population of over 105,000, consisting of Hungarians, Germans, Rumanians and Jews. The town is an important rail and road junction and the cultural centre of all the three

12: Kormos S-4, 5 (no date) 1944
ED1 Rumania ED1

[The Bukovina]

rule. It was occupied by the Russians in 1769. In 1774 the province was given to Austria, under which it remained until 1918. On 23 October the Austrian governor handed over the Bukovina to the Ukrainian inhabitants of the province; but four days later an assembly of Rumanian Bukovinians declared for the union of the province with Rumania and asked the Rumanian government for military assistance. This was forthcoming on 11 November and added to Rumania a territory of about 4,100 square miles with a population of about 870,000 (1930). Of these over 38% were Ukrainians, 34% Rumanians and 21% Germans and German-speaking Jews. The Rumanian administration began by a vigorous policy of Rumanization. The Ukrainians, who under Austrian rule had been well treated, and the Jews, were the chief sufferers, but the Germans, too, were ousted from many of their positions.[1]

More than half of the Bukovina is covered with dense forests of beech;[2] one-fifth consists of pastures; less than a third is arable land. The province borders in the west on the Carpathians, in the south on Moldavia, in the east on Moldavia and Bessarabia and in the north on Poland. The western part of the Bukovina is formed by the slopes of the Carpathians, where manganese and iron ore are found, especially in the region of Jacobeni. To the east stretches the hilly country, covered with pastures, on which good livestock is raised, and fields of maize, wheat and tobacco. Mineral resources are confined to some. Small deposits of coal, gold and lead, but the industry of the province is well developed.

[1] The German University of Czernowitz was completely Rumanized soon after the military occupation.

[2] The German name of the province means 'Land of the Beeches'.

12: Kormos S-4, 5 (no date) 1944
ED1 Rumania ED1

[Bessarabia]

by the valleys through which flow the tributaries of the Pruth and Dniester. In the south, beginning near Besarabeasca, extends the Budjak steppe which merges into the sandy soils, salt marshes and lagoons of the delta of the Danube and of the Black Sea coast. The climate of Bessarabia is the same as that of the regions east of the Dniester. The summers are very hot and dry, the winters very cold with icy winds and great snowfalls. Nevertheless, crops grow well in Bessarabia and 61% of the whole area is arable land. The chief products are maize, wheat, tobacco and wine and lately also soya beans. There are few factories and the only source of income for the people, apart from agriculture, is the fishing industry in the south.

The capital of Bessarabia is Kishineff (Chisinau[R]) with a population of over 200,000 (1935). Here are concentrated such industrial enterprises as the province possesses, the most important being flour mills, leather factories and other secondary industries connected with agriculture.

The first colonization of Bessarabia was carried out by the Romans who succeeded in occupying this territory only for a short time. During the great period of migration (seventh to tenth centuries), the province was invaded by a host of tribes. Bessarabia was first occupied by Rumanians in the early fourteenth century and incorporated in Moldavia in 1367. A century and a half later Southern Bessarabia fell to Turkey, but several merchant-colonies were still administered by Genoese and Venetian traders on the Danube delta and the Black Sea coast. In the following centuries Bessarabia was often a battleground for Russian and Turkish armies, who alter-

12: Kormos S-4, 5 (no date) 1944
ED1 Rumania ED1

p 59

Chapter IV

ECONOMIC WEALTH OF THE COUNTRY

Greater Rumania was primarily an agricultural country, but its industry held an important place in the economy of South-Eastern Europe. With its fertile soil, great reserves of mineral resources and considerable water-power Rumania could have been one of the richest countries in Europe. But while the land was full of natural wealth the standard of living of the people remained a low one. Only a small part of Rumania's resources was exploited, and an even smaller part for the benefit of her inhabitants.

About three-fifths of the area of the Kingdom were arable land and pastures, and over four-fifths of her population were employed in agriculture, forestry and in the fishing industry. The unbalanced state of Rumania's economy in the period between the two wars is shown by the fact that in spite of the predominantly agricultural character of the country, Rumanian industry, employing only one-twentieth of the population, was responsible for half of the total production as expressed in value. Approximately two-thirds of all income from exports were also derived from industrial products, chiefly oil, of which Rumania is the foremost European exporter.

One million workers and employees, or one-twentieth of the population, contributing one-half of the total yearly value of production: this is one very significant aspect of the economic struc-

315 pipeline has been completed from a secondary source of supply at Manești to convey this gas to Bucarest to supply both household and industrial requirements.

135 Iron-ore deposits are small, so that the heavy industries are very largely dependent on imports. A variety of other mineral resources, which are believed to exist in greater abundance than has so far been established, have not yet been fully surveyed.

433 Rumania has a poorly-developed industry, which lags far behind that of western European countries such as Czechoslovakia, though is ahead of all the other south-east European countries, except Hungary. Financially she is a poor country, with very limited capital resources, which has proved a severe hindrance to industrial development and has laid her open to the investment of foreign capital, which has been attracted particularly by the rich mineral oil and forest resources. Skilled labour, also a vital factor in the process of industrialisation, has been lacking, so that the use of foreign technicians has been essential. Other raw-material resources, though adequate to allow the development of a sound and varied industry, are not sufficiently extensive to encourage a very rapid development independent of imported raw materials.

[457]
[464]

Industrialisation in Rumania did not start until about 1890, and the period of greatest expansion was between 1929 and 1938. The consumption industries were the first to be developed, and of these food industries are the chief, the raw materials being grown on the spot. The growth of such industries as paper, cardboard, printing, soap, chemicals and furniture, etc., followed. The location of industry in the earlier stages was governed not by such factors as the existence of cheap labour, but was built up in those areas richest in raw materials.

MAIN INDUSTRIAL REGIONS

[311] The main industrial region is in the Prahova valley, where the oilfields are to be found, followed by the Reșița district, where the existence of iron ore, coal, manganese, etc., led to the development of metallurgical and engineering facilities, as well as of such auxiliary industries as coal and wood distilleries. Gold, silver, lead, zinc and copper deposits in the Baia Mare region formed the basis for the erection of both metal and chemical factories. The presence of methane gas, salt, gold, silver and stone quarries in and around Turda determined the location of factories for production of cement, limestone, bricks, tiles, porcelain, glass, sulphuric acid, etc. In the rich forest districts of Ferdinand, Nadrag and Hunedoara, where iron ore deposits are also to be found, blast furnaces and metallurgical industries have been established. The textile industry is mainly established in Cisnădia, Piatra Neamț, Bacău and Buhuși. Apart from the regions mentioned, industry is centred in the principal towns—Bucarest, Timișoara, Brașov, Sf. Gheorghe, Arad, Galați, Brăila, Cernăuți, Cluj and Iași.

The following table gives an idea of the relative importance of the various industries, showing the amount of capital invested and value of production in each of the main groups, and also the number of factories and of personnel employed —

[3c]

728 of requirements for sulphuric-acid production. Of lesser importance were the salt and coal deposits.

[135]

[313] The forest resources of Northern Transylvania are estimated to have accounted for as much as 25 per cent. of pre-war timber production. Apart from timber the food and leather industries appear to have been the most developed. This [311] area was principally made up of forests and pastures; the arable land provided no surplus after local needs had been covered. Of livestock [333] losses the most outstanding feature was nearly 2 million sheep.

[496] The railway system, and particularly the railway administration, was severely handicapped by the change of frontiers, which in places cut one part of Rumania off from the other.

Caliacra and Durostor, the two ceded Dobrujan provinces, are mainly agricultural, and though producing a small surplus, contributed little to Rumania's total agricultural output. Of more significance is the cotton-growing area. There are no known mineral deposits, and industry in this area is on a very small scale, relying mainly on handicrafts.

TRANSNISTRIA

727 Transnistria is the name which has been given to the territory lying between the Dniester and the Bug, which was given to Rumania to administer in 1941 subsequent to its capture from the U.S.S.R. by Rumanian and German troops. Transnistria is part of the Southern Ukraine and is mainly agricultural, while such industry as existed has been of no use to the Rumanians on account of the heavy destruction carried out by the Russians. It is probably true to say that this territory has been more of a financial liability than an asset to Rumania on account of the heavy expenditure entailed in repairs, particularly of railways and bridges. Some little advantage has, however, been gained from the harvest of 1942-3.

241 peasant views with suspicion and often hostility all attempts at improvements in traditional [474] methods. Even the co-operative societies have made less progress than in other Danubian countries. There is need for considerable capital expenditure in grouping small farms into larger units, in providing better buildings, more implements and fertilisers. There is need for diversification of production—more fodder crops and more animal husbandry. Above all, there is need for development in industry and commerce to provide work for the surplus agricultural population.

2. Natural Conditions and Regions

132 The climate is of the extreme Continental type, with long hot summers and severe winters. Precipitation is largely concentrated in winter and early summer. During the greater part of the growing and ripening season rains are light, and from time to time serious droughts occur which may ruin the grain crops.

133 The agricultural regions correspond to the natural divisions into plain and hill country—the ●311 Danube plain and Bessarabia which comprise the greater part of the territory and produce the bulk of the crops, and the hilly and mountainous land of Transylvania and the Bucovina.

The plain is well-suited for agriculture, the soil [134] over much of it being of the fertile *chernozem* or black earth type, but the backward methods of farming and the light rainfall keep yields per acre low.

This region is not equally backward in all parts. The Rumanian Banat at the western end of the country, and formerly part of Hungary, is more prosperous and progressive. The population is [162] not purely Rumanian but includes Swabians and Saxons, descendants of the German stock systematically settled there on medium-sized peasant holdings in the eighteenth century after the cession of the territory to Austria by the Turks. Methods and yields, by Rumanian standards, are good. [231] The livestock density is higher than the average and the area produces a substantial surplus of pigs. Rural overcrowding is not as marked as elsewhere.

241 Conditions of life and methods of farming are 133 considerably worse in the plain land of the Old Kingdom. Agriculture here is as primitive as in any part of Eastern Europe, depending on an unbroken alternation of wheat and maize cultivation with little subsidiary production. Some wheat is marketed, but the maize is grown largely [311] for consumption on the farms. So little land is available per head of population that the farm population and working animals (which eat the maize stalks) can be fed only by devoting an excessive acreage to maize.

Bessarabia makes up the remainder of the plain land; conditions of settlement and farming methods are much the same as in the Old Kingdom, but the density of population is lower and there are substantial grain exports.

Given normal yields, every district of the plain area is at least self-sufficient in foodstuffs; indeed parts of it regularly produce large grain surpluses. Transitional areas between the Danube Valley and the Transylvanian plateau, such as the Carpatho-Moldavia and Carpatho-Muntenia areas, may,

[6c]

241 133 however, be slightly deficient in grain, especially in poor years.

●[311] The hilly land of Transylvania and the Bucovina differs markedly from the plain. There is proportionately less arable and much more meadow, grazing and forest land. The soil is poor. Methods are not as primitive as in the plain land of the Old Kingdom, but over-crowding is more serious and output per head is consequently lower. Parts of this region are slightly deficient in grain. Though [1116] the level of food consumption is low, the dietary is more varied than elsewhere in the country, less maize and more meat and dairy produce being eaten.

3. Crops

311 Of the total area of pre-war Rumania, of nearly 30 million hectares (110,000 sq. miles) and twice the area of England and Wales, about 13 million hectares, or 45 per cent. was arable. Permanent meadow, pasture and grazing occupied 14 per cent., while tree and bush crops accounted for a further 2 per cent. The remaining land was non-agricultural, forest and waste land.

243 A very high proportion of the arable—over 80 per cent.—was used for grain growing, principally maize, wheat and barley. Owing to low rainfall, use of poor seed and lack of fertilisers, yields were at a low level and fluctuated widely from year to year.

[439] Out of an average grain production of 11 million tons, 6 millions went into domestic human consumption and 1½ million were exported, the remainder going to fodder, seed and waste. Grain exports have always figured largely in the country's foreign trade. During the twenty years 1920 to 1939 they only once fell below a million tons, and in some years exceeded three million tons. In value, during the decade before the war, they formed, after petroleum products, the main item in exports.

241 No other category of crops compares with grain. Sown fodder crops took barely 5 per cent. of the arable, all other crops, including potatoes, fibres, oilseeds, tobacco and sugar beet, about 8 per cent. Peas, beans and oilseeds were grown in sufficient quantities to provide surpluses for export. Germany established two companies—Solagra in 1934 and Soya A.G. in 1940—which invested large sums in promoting oilseed cultivation. The area 177 under sunflower was raised only slightly, but that under soya rose from nil in 1933 to 103,000 ha. (254,000 acres) in 1939, but the greater part of both crops was located in Bessarabia which Rumania lost to the U.S.S.R. in 1940 (see below).

244 Production of potatoes, vegetables and sugar 247 beet was just sufficient for domestic consumption, but the tobacco crop did not quite meet requirements. Tobacco production had fallen from 20,000 tons in the late nineteen-twenties to 12,000 tons in the years just prior to the war.

248 Fruit production was undeveloped and there was little organised marketing and processing. Plums were the main crop, but three-quarters of the output was used for making brandy. Apples and other kinds of fruit, and walnuts, were produced in fair quantities, but exports were insignificant, and, owing to low quality and the lack of standardisation, there were no prospects of development.

146 262 Largely because of its cost, the consumption of sugar is very low, except among the well-to-do in the towns. (To encourage sugar-beet growing, a high price was set by the Government.)

[785] The diet is further impoverished by the long religious fasts—seven weeks before Easter, six weeks before Christmas, two shorter summer periods, plus Wednesdays and Fridays of each week. The diet during the fast includes practically no food of animal origin. Children under 10 years do not normally observe these fasts and, in fact, usually have a better diet during these periods since more milk, eggs and butter are available for them.

The diet, though fairly adequate in energy value, is short of animal protein, fats and calcium; moreover, where maize is the principal cereal lack of vitamin B_2 may be very serious. Various symptoms of vitamin and mineral deficiencies are [165] observed, and the high infant-mortality rate—the highest in Europe—is also partly due to malnutrition. One of the most serious effects of the poor diet is the nervous disease pellagra, caused by the deficiency of the vitamin B_2 factor. In Moldavia, where maize is the staple food, about 5 per cent. [164] of the rural population suffers from pellagra every spring. In the whole country about 3,000 deaths occur each year from this disease (compared with 4,000 in the maize-eating southern states of U.S.A.).

The average annual pre-war food consumption of Rumania is shown in the following table, with comparative figures for the United Kingdom.

Average per Head Consumption

	Rumania		*United Kingdom*	
	Kg.	*Lb.*	*Kg.*	*Lb.*
Wheat and rye	104	229	129	285
Maize	166	365	—	—
Potatoes	50	110	84	185
Sugar	5	11	43	95
Meat	17	37	63	139
Milk	70	123*	94	165*
Butter	1	2	11	24
Pig fat	4	10	5	11
Vegetable oil	1·5	3	—	—
Margarine	—	—	4	10
Calories per day	2,700		3,100	

*Pints

B. WAR-TIME CHANGES

1. Territorial Changes

228 241 ●311 The net effect of the territorial changes which have occurred since 1939 is the loss of Northern Transylvania to Hungary and of Southern Dobruja to Bulgaria. For two seasons' crops, 1940 and 1941, Rumania was without Bessarabia, but in the late summer of 1941 she not only regained Bessarabia but acquired administrative control of the Soviet territory now styled Transnistria, and this has made small contributions to the food supplies of Rumania in 1942-43. Ignoring Transnistria, however, Rumania lost 12 per cent. of her former arable area and grain production. The Transylvanian areas ceded to Hungary, though not rich agriculturally, probably needed only small imports of grain to supplement their own production, while south Dobruja, though a surplus producing area, contributed only a fraction to Rumania's total agricultural production. The country's potential agricultural export remains, therefore, substantially what it was before the war.

2. Agriculture in War Years

241 722 Germany, at the outbreak of the war, looked to the Danube countries, and to Rumania in particu-